













Baptism

Vol. 1

1787

*Sas.*  
Librarian

**Uttarpara Joykrishna Public Library**  
**Govt. of West Bengal**



---

---

## P R E F A C E.

HAVING observed for a course of years that many of the most learned and eminent Pædobaptists, when theological subjects are under discussion, frequently argue on such principles, admit of such facts, interpret various texts of Scripture in such a manner, and make such concessions, as are greatly in favour of the Baptists; I extracted a number of passages from their publications, and made many references to others, which I thought might be fairly pleaded against Infant Sprinkling\*. On reviewing these quotations and *memoranda*, I concluded, merely for my own private use, to employ some leisure hours in transcribing and arranging them under different heads of the Pædobaptist controversy.

When I had made a considerable progress in the work of transcription and arrangement, Mr. HENRY'S *Treatise on Baptism* fell into my hands†. Prepossessed of

\* N. B. As the terms *Infant Sprinkling*, wherever they occur in this Treatise, are used merely by way of distinction, and not of contempt; so the expressions, *Pædo-baptism*, and *Infant Baptism*, are used in compliance with general custom; not because the author thinks an infant is *baptized*, on whom water has been solemnly poured, or sprinkled.

† The MONTHLY REVIEWERS, after pronouncing this 'the most popular defence of Infant baptism, and of the mode of sprinkling,'

of a high regard for the character of that work. *Author, I perused the Treatise with care. Not convinced, however, by any thing contained in it, that the Sprinkling of Infants is an appointment of Christ; and being fully persuaded that Mr. HENRY had employed his learning and zeal in defence of an unscriptural ceremony; I determined to prosecute the subject with greater application, and to publish the result of my enquiries and thoughts concerning it. Such was the occasion of this publication.*

The method of arguing here adopted is far from being either novel or unfair: it has been used by the Spirit of infallibility, against Pagans\*; by Christians, against the Jews†; by the Reformed against Roman Catholics; and by Protestant Dissenters, against our English Conformists‡. It is, in a particular manner, employed and pursued by the Author of, *Popery con-*

\* ling, that hath appeared, very justly add; ‘Some reflections, however, which he calls on them [the Baptists] mode of baptism (which perhaps the Editor might as well have omitted)---are scarcely consistent with that candour and liberality which might have been expected from the Author, and which, had he been now living, he would probably have discovered.’ *Monthly Review*, for April, 1784. p. 313. My reader may see in what an illiberal manner Mr. HENRY has reflected on the baptismal immersion, and some animadversions upon it, Vol. I. Chap. IV. Reflect. VII. of this work.

\* Acts xviii. 28. Titus i. 12. † So WIRSIUS, for instance, in his *Judeus Christianizans*, p. 276---402. and HOORNBEKIIUS, *Contra Judæos*, L. II. C. i. L. IV. C. ii. ‡ A remarkable instance of this kind is mentioned by Mr. PEIRCE, who having informed us that Bp. HOADLY and Mr. OLLYFE wrote against Dr. CALAMY, in defence of their own Conformity, adds; ‘It happened, as is very usual with our adversaries, that these two defended Conformity upon different principles. Dr. CALAMY therefore in his Answer set their arguments one against another, and to handsomely defended our cause---that the Dissenters looked upon themselves obliged, not only to the Doctor for his Defence, but to his antagonists, who gave him the occasion of writing.’ *Vindicat. of Dissent*. Part I. p. 282.

*fuend*

## P R E F A C E.

*Justified by Papists*; a book, indeed, which I had not seen, till the far greater part of these pages was composed. The following words of that anonymous writer may be justly applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to the present subject. ‘ I will call the church of Rome for  
‘ a witness to our cause; and if she do not plainly con-  
‘ fess the antiquity of our tenets; and the novelty of her  
‘ own; if she herself do not proclaim the universality  
‘ of our faith; if she do not confess, that we are both  
‘ in the more certain and safe way in the Protestant  
‘ church, I will neither refuse the name\*—of an *Ana-*  
*baptist*, nor any part of that censure which is due to  
such a character.

Though I do not approve of every sentiment con-  
tained in the following quotations produced on behalf  
of the Baptists; yet as the generality of those Pædo-  
baptists from whose writings the extracts were made,  
must be considered as persons of learning and emi-  
nence, in the several communions to which they be-  
longed; and as no small number of them were famous  
Professors in Protestant universities; their declara-  
tions, in the *argumentum ad hominem*, cannot but have  
the utmost weight. Nor can their testimonies, con-  
cerning the signification of Greek terms, or the prac-  
tice of the church in former ages, be hastily rejected,  
without incurring the imputation of gross ignorance,  
of enormous pride, or of shameful precipitancy. Con-  
sidering the quotations adduced, and the characters of  
those writers from whom they were taken; it is pre-  
sumed that the leading ideas of another paragraph, in  
*Papery confuted by Papists*, may be here applied. ‘ If  
‘ these witnesses had been ignorant and unlearned men,  
‘ or excommunicate persons in their own church;

\* *Papery confuted by Papists*, Sect. VIII. p. 43.

## P R E F A C E

\* —there might be some plea why their testimonies  
 should not be admitted. But when the points in ques-  
 tion are articles of their own creed; when they are  
 witnessed by popes, by councils, by cardinals, by  
 bishops, by learned doctors and schoolmen in their  
 own church, on our behalf, and against their own  
 tenets; I see no cause why I should not demand  
 judgment in defence of our church, and trial of our  
 cause. It is the law of God and man, *I will judge  
 thee out of thine own mouth\**. Thus also Mr. CLAUDE,  
 when confuting the Roman Catholics; ‘I will make  
 their authors that are not suspected by them to speak,  
 whose passages I will faithfully translate, which they  
 may see in the originals if they will take the pains†.’  
 To which I may add the following words of another  
 Pædobaptist, which are considered by him as a kind  
 of axiom. ‘The confessions of enemies, and cir-  
 cumstances favourable to any body of men, collected  
 from the writings of their adversaries, are deserving  
 of particular regard‡.’ *Testimonium Adversarii con-  
 tra se Validissimum.*

The Reader will find that our auxiliaries in this dis-  
 pute are both numerous and respectable: for while a  
 multitude of Pædobaptists reluctantly concede this,  
 that, and the other, in support of Immersion upon a  
 Profession of Faith; those who may be justly esteemed  
 impartial judges of the evidence produced on both

\* *Ut supra*, Sect. X. p. 152.      † *Defence of Reformation*,  
 Part II. p. 127.      ‡ Dr. PRIESTLEY'S *Letters to Dr. HORS-*

LEY, p. 137. ‘What, says the learned CHAMBER, can be a more  
 convincing proof, than that which arises from the confession of an  
 adversary?’ *Pamphlet*, Tom. IV. L. VIII. C. ix. § 4. Conforma-  
 bly to which Mr. TRAVIS, when speaking of a particular fact,  
 says; It ‘is proved by the best testimony possible, the acknowledg-  
 ment of an adversary.’ *Letters to Mr. GIBBON*, Lett. III.  
 Edit. 2d.

## P R E F A C E.

*Sides of this debate, very cheerfully award the cause to us. Yes, those disinterested Friends, the people called Quakers, without so much as one exception occurring to observation, pour in their attestations on our behalf, and treat Infant Sprinkling as a merely human invention.*

Though I am not conscious of having misrepresented the meaning of any Pædobaptist, whose testimony is produced; yet, as the quotations are very numerous, and as many of them are translated from the Latin, it is possible that mistakes may be discovered, by those readers who accurately compare my quotations with the writers from whom they were taken. Such mistakes it is hoped, however, will be found comparatively few, and of trifling importance. I am persuaded, therefore, that the judicious and candid will impute them to inadvertency, or ignorance; rather than to a disingenuous intention.

A learned foreigner has justly observed, that while all Christians deservedly acknowledge the Bible as a Divine Revelation, it has fallen out, that every one desires to find in that sacred volume whatever in his own imagination seems divine: and that men are so wonderfully happy in this respect, as hardly ever to complain of being disappointed, or of having lost their labour, in searching the sacred Records for what they wanted; but all, in the language of self-gratulation, repeat the old *εὕρηκα* of ARCHIMEDES, *I have found it! I have found it!*—It is but too frequently, says Mr. PLACETTE, that we see truth clashing with our temporal interests, with the secret bias of our hearts, with our most violent passions, and of other things which we make the ordinary measures of our con-

\* WERENFELSII *Opuscula*, p. 376, 377.



' duct. Whenever this happens, we ought to despise  
 ' these vain interests, to stifle these inclinations, to re-  
 ' press these criminal motions, and in all our proceed-  
 ' ings to stick close to the unalterable rule of truth.  
 ' But we cannot bring ourselves to such a resolution :  
 ' on the quite contrary, we endeavour to ply and bend  
 ' this rule ; and instead of conforming ourselves to it,  
 ' would have it conform to ourselves. Not being able  
 ' to change it, because it is really constant and perpe-  
 ' tual, our next attempt is to change our own judg-  
 ' ment about it. We try to persuade ourselves out  
 ' of its directions ; and with much pains and labour,  
 ' we come at length to succeed in our design. No  
 ' man can indeed be ignorant of that mighty sway  
 ' which the heart bears over the understanding. Ac-  
 ' cording to the order of nature, and the intention of  
 ' its divine Author, it is the understanding that ought  
 ' to guide the heart, and to be set up as its faithful  
 ' lamp and light : but in common experience we see  
 ' the reverse of this. The heart draws aside the un-  
 ' derstanding that way to which itself inclines ; and if  
 ' it fail to do this immediately, and by absolute com-  
 ' mand, it carries its point by time and stratagem. It  
 ' hinders the intellectual power from attending to such  
 ' reasons as are disagreeable to itself, and keeps it per-  
 ' petually busied about the opposite arguments. It  
 ' makes us look on the former with a secret desire that  
 ' they may prove false, and on the latter with a most  
 ' unjust wish that we may find them true : and then  
 ' no wonder if it be successful in its arts, and if it ef-  
 ' fectually lead us into error\*.'

Very important is that declaration of our Lord ; *If  
 any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine ;  
 whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself :* with

\* *Christian Castig.*, B. II. Chap. xxiii.

which the following direction of Bp. TAYLOR agrees.  
 'If a man enquires after truth earnestly, as after things  
 ' of great concernment; if he prays to God to assist,  
 ' and uses those means which are in his hand and are  
 ' his best for the finding it; if he be indifferent to any  
 ' proposition, and loves it not for any consideration  
 ' but because he thinks it true; if he will quit any in-  
 ' terest rather than lose a truth; if he dares own what  
 ' he hath found and believed, and if he loves it so  
 ' much the more, by how much he believes it more  
 ' conducing to piety and the honour of God: he hath  
 ' done what a good and wise man should do. He  
 ' needs not regard what any man threatens, nor fear  
 ' God's anger when a man of another sect threatens  
 ' him with damnation. For he that heartily endea-  
 ' vours to please God, and searches what his will is  
 ' that he may obey it, certainly loves God; and no-  
 ' thing that loves God can perish\*.'—Such is the rule  
 of our duty in this respect: but as we are far from being  
 insensible of our liability to be influenced by preju-  
 dices and corrupt affections, in our enquiries after the  
 mind of God respecting the ordinance of Baptism; it  
 is no small satisfaction to find that our most learned  
 and eminent Opposers have said so much in favour of  
 Immersion, upon a Profession of faith, as the appoint-  
 ment of Jesus Christ. For, as Dr. OWEN observes,  
 ' Truth and good company will give a modest man  
 ' confidence†.'

In proportion as I have become acquainted with  
 the Popish controversy, and with that between our  
 English Episcopalians and Protestant Dissenters, the  
 more have I been convinced that there is a remarkable  
 similarity between the arguments used by Roman Ca-

\* *De Ter. Dubitant.* p. 755. See Mr. LOCKE's *Conduct of the Un-  
 derstanding*, Sect. XI.

† *Indication of just SURRENDER*, p. 41.

## P R E F A C E.

tholics, in defence of Popery; by our Conformists, in support of their Establishment; and by Pædobaptists in general, in favour of Infantsprinkling. It gives me therefore peculiar pleasure to find, that the general principles on which I oppose Pædobaptism are the very same with those upon which the Reformed have always proceeded, in confuting the Papal system, and upon which Protestant Dissenters argue against the constitution, government, and unscriptural rites of the English Church. By these considerations I am the more confirmed in my disapprobation of Infant sprinkling. Agreeable to which are the following words of Dr. GALAMY, when speaking of the persecuted Nonconformists, and of their leading principles.

- They were the more confirmed in their adherence to
- these principles, by finding the most eminent divines
- of the church forced to make use of the very same in
- their noble defence of the Reformation, against the
- Romanists: and indeed it seemed to them remark-
- able that those which were reckoned, by the clergy,
- the most successful weapons against the Dissenters,
- should be the same that are used by the Papists against
- the Protestant Reformation\*.

In the course of my Reflections on the language and arguments of some Pædobaptists, the Reader will meet with a few strokes of pleasantry. It is presumed, however, that he will have no reason to complain of *ill temper*, or of a want of benevolence to any from whom I conscientiously differ. For though it appears from several quotations, that the hardest things have been said of the Baptists by some of their opposers†; and though it must be acknowledged the

Baptists

\* *Nonconformist's Memorial*, Introduction p 53.      † Dr FERRER-  
 acknowledges that, when writing against the Baptists, 'he  
 could

Baptists have sometimes resorted in an unbecoming manner; yet as every one must confess that the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God, so it may be observed of the cause that is here pleaded,

*Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis.*

Some persons, to avoid the labour of thinking, and to keep their consciences easy in a compliance with prevailing custom, pronounce baptism a *controverted point*; and then infer, that all disputes about the mode and subjects of the ordinance, are not only *stale* and unimportant, but unworthy the character of any who profess a warm regard for the interests of moral virtue, or for the Person, the atonement, and the grace of Jesus Christ. That baptism has been the subject of much controversy, must be allowed: but then I will say with Bp. HURD, 'Show me the question in religion, or even in common morals, about which learned men have not disagreed; nay, show me a single text of Scripture, though ever so plain and precise, which the perverseness or ingenuity of interpreters has not drawn into different, and often contrary meanings. What then shall we conclude? that there is no truth in religion, no certainty in morals, no authority in sacred Scripture? If such conclusions as these be carried to their utmost length, in what else can they terminate, but absolute universal skepticism?' I may add, in the words of Dr. WATERLAND, 'As long as religion, [or any particular branch of it,] is held in any value or esteem, and meets with opposers, it must occasion warm dis-

'could hardly dip his pen in any other liquor than the juice of gall.'  
In CROSSBY's *Hist. Bap.* Vol. I. Part. p. 5. See BACKUS's *Church Hist. of New Eng.* Vol. II. p. 323, 324.

\* *Introduct. to Study of Prophecies*, Sermon. VIII.

## P R E F A C E

putes. Who would wish that it should not? What remedy is there for it, while men are men, which is not infinitely worse than the disease? A total contempt of religion [or an universal and absolute indifference for any particular article in it,] might end all disputes about it : nothing else will\*.

It must indeed be acknowledged, that positive rites, forms of worship, and ecclesiastical order, are not of equal importance with doctrines that immediately respect the Object of our worship, as rational creatures ; the ground of our hope, as criminals deserving to perish ; or the source of our blessedness, as intended for an immortal existence. Nor is the most punctual performance of a ritual service, detached from faith in Christ and benevolence to man, worthy of being compared with truly devotional principles and virtuous tempers, though attended with much ignorance relating to the positive parts of divine worship. But is this a sufficient reason for treating the law of baptism as of little or no importance—as if it were obsolete, or as if our Great Legislator had no meaning when he enacted it? That mutilation of the sacred supper, which is practised in the Romish communion, has been sharply opposed and loudly condemned by all denominations of Protestants : and is it not lawful, is it not matter of duty, to oppose and condemn such an outrage on divine authority and primitive example? Are we not required to *contend earnestly*, but with virtuous dispositions, *for every branch of that faith which was once delivered to the saints*? If, therefore, infants be solemnly sprinkled by divine right, it must be the indispensable duty of Pædobaptists to contend for it ; but if, on the contrary, Infant sprinkling be a

\* *Importance of Doctr. of Trinity*, p. 206.

human invention; the Baptists are equally bound to oppose it, as deserving to be banished from the worship of God, where it has long usurped the place of a divine institution. If Christ be the only Lord and Law-giver in his own kingdom, then certainly it is far from being a matter of indifference whether the laws which he enacted be regarded or not. For with equal reason might any one question whether our Saviour should be *believed*, in what he declares, as whether he should be *obeyed*, in what he commands. Under the fair pretext of charity, forbearance, and catholicism, we might, with MELANCHTON and other adiaphorists in the sixteenth century, consider the doctrine of justification by faith alone, the number of the sacraments, the jurisdiction claimed by the Pope, extreme unction, the observation of Popish festivals, and several superstitious rites, as things *indifferent*\*: or, with others, we might assert the innocence of mental error, in matters of doctrine and of worship; and so, by unavoidable consequence, render the Bible itself of little worth.

It has been often asserted, both by ancients and moderns, that the followers of Christ should never seek for peace at the expence of truth, nor of religious duty. Thus, for example, HILARY, bishop of Poitiers: 'The name of *peace*, is indeed very specious, and the mere appearance of *unity* has something splendid in it: but who knows not, that the church and the gospel acknowledge no other peace than that which comes from Jesus Christ, that which he gave to his Apostles before the glory of his passion, and that which he left in trust with them by his eternal

\* See MOSHEIM'S *Eccl. Hist.* Cent. XVI. Sect. III. Part ii. § 28. VENERABLE *Eccl. Hist.* Secul. XVI. § 156.

command, when he was about to leave them\*?

Dr. OWEN: "We are not engaged in an enquiry merely after *peace*, but after *peace with truth*. Yea, to lay aside the consideration of truth, in a disquisition after peace and agreement, in and about spiritual things, is to exclude a regard unto God and his authority, and to provide only for ourselves—The rule of unity, as it is supposed to comprise all church-communion, falls under many restrictions. For herein the special commands of Christ, and institutions of the gospel committed unto our care and observance falling under consideration, our practice is precisely limited unto those commands, and by the nature of those institutions—We are not obliged to accommodate any of the ways or truths of Christ unto the sins and ignorance of men†." J. A. TUR-

BRETTIN: "There ought to be no charity without truth; no charity that is an injury to truth; no charity which causes us to offend against the truth—For this ought not to be called *charity*, but a confederation and a conspiracy of error. *We wish*, says JEROM, *for peace; and we not only wish, but also pray for it: but it is the peace of Christ, true peace, peace in which no war is involved*. Otherwise, as NAZIANZEN teaches, *war is more eligible than that peace which separates us from God‡*." Mr. HENRY: "The method of our prayer must be, first for truth, and then for peace; for such is the method of the wisdom that is from above: it is *first pure, then peaceable§*." With this both Prophets and Apostles

\* In CLAUDE's *Defence of Reformation*, Part III. p. 3. + *Discourse on Evangelical Love and Peace*, p. 17, 24, 253. † *Oratio de Theologo Veritatis et Pacis Studio* § *Exposit. on Rom. xv. 5.*

## P R E F A C E

agree! for their language is, *Love the truth, and peace*.  
*—Speaking the truth in love\**.

The folly and impiety of pleading for charity and peace, at the expence of divine truth and of religious duty, are well represented and properly chastised by a Pædobaptist author, in the following manner. 'A considerable succedaneum for the Christian unity, is the catholic charity; which is like the charity commended by Paul, in only this one instance, that it *groweth exceedingly*—Among the stricter sort it goes under the name of *forbearance*. We shall be much mistaken if we think that, by this soft and agreeable word, is chiefly meant the tenderness and compassion inculcated by the precepts of Jesus Christ and his Apostles. It strictly means, an agreement to differ quietly about the doctrines and commandments of the gospel, without interruption of visible fellowship. They distinguish carefully between *fundamentals*, or things necessary to be believed and practised; and *circumstantials*, or things that are indifferent. Now whatever foundation there may be for such a distinction in human systems of religion, it certainly looks very ill-becoming in the churches of Christ, to question how far HÆ is to be believed and obeyed. Our modern churches—have nearly agreed to hold all those things indifferent, which would be inconvenient and disreputable: and to have communion together, in observing somewhat like the customs of their forefathers. Many of the plainest sayings of Jesus Christ and the Apostles are treated with high contempt, by the advocates of this *forbearance*—The common people are persuaded to believe, that all the ancient institutions of Christi-

\* Zech. viii. 19. Eph. iv. 15.



anity were merely local and temporary; excepting  
 such as the learned have agreed to be suitable to  
 these times; or, which have been customarily ob-  
 served by their predecessors. But it would well be-  
 come the doctors in divinity to show, by what autho-  
 rity any injunction of God can be revoked, besides  
 his own; or, how any man's conscience can be law-  
 fully released, by custom, example, or human autho-  
 rity, from observing such things as were instituted  
 by the Apostles of Christ in his name—This cor-  
 rupt forbearance had no allowed place in the primi-  
 tive churches. The Apostle, in the Epistle to the  
 Ephesians, required of them, to adorn their vocation  
 with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering,  
 forbearing one another, IN LOVE. But had they  
 dispensed with the laws of Christ, for conveni-  
 ence and ease, it had been forbearing one another in  
 hatred. For those laws were expressions of his love;  
 the most fervent love that was ever shown among  
 men, directed by infallible wisdom. Whosoever  
 therefore would obliterate them, or any how attempt  
 to change them, must either suppose himself wiser  
 than Jesus Christ, or a greater friend to mankind.  
 He must be moved, either by an enormous self-con-  
 ceit; or by the spirit of malevolence—The more  
 thinking part of religious men, observing what great  
 mischiefs have arisen from contentions about truth,  
 —have found it most desirable to let truth alone, and  
 to concern themselves chiefly about living profitably  
 in civil society. To be of some religion, is but de-  
 cent; and the interests of human life require that it  
 be popular and compliant. If men have different  
 notions of Jesus Christ, his divinity, his sacrifice,  
 his kingdom, and the customs of his religion, even  
 from what the Apostles seemed to have; charity de-  
 mands

## PREFACE

intends that we think well of their religious characters, notwithstanding this. It is unbecoming the modesty of wise men to be confident on any side; and contending earnestly for opinions, injures the peace of the Christian church. Thus kind and humble is modern charity!—Instead of rejoicing in, or with *the truth*, it rejoiceth in contemplating the admirable piety that may be produced from so many different, yea, opposite principles—The Christians of old time were taught, not to dispute about the institutions of their LORD, but to observe them thankfully; and hereby they expressed their affection to him and to each other. If that affection be granted to be more important than the tokens of it, it would be unjust to infer that the latter have no obligation; which would imply, that Christ and the Apostles meant nothing by their precepts. The Methodists have not, indeed, gone so far as their spiritual brethren [the Quakers] have done, in rejecting all external ceremonies; but they are taught to believe, that all concern about the ancient order and customs of the Christians is mere party-spirit, and injurious to the devout exercises of the heart. Thus the modern charity vaunts itself, in answering, better purposes than could be accomplished by keeping the words of Christ. It produces a more extensive and generous communion, and animates the devotion of men, without perplexing them by uncertain doctrines, or rigorous self-denial—Although it supposes some Revelation from God, and some honour due to Jesus Christ; it claims a right to dispense with both; to choose what, in his doctrine and religion, is fit to be believed and observed\*.

\* *Strictures upon Modern Simony*, p. 48—55. LUTHER, in his vehement manner, says; *Maledicta sit charitas qua servatur cum iactura*.

While, however, we think it our duty with a resolute perseverance to maintain the purity and importance of baptism, as a divine institution; we are far from considering ourselves as the only disciples of Christ, or our own communities as the only Christian churches. Nor is an idea of that kind justly inferrible from our denying communion at the Lord's-table to Pædobaptists\*. Respecting this particular Dr. OWEN says; 'There is no necessity that any should deny all them to be true churches, from whom they may have just reason to withdraw their communion—When we judge of our own communion with them; it is not upon this question, Whether they are true churches, or no? as though the determination of our practice did depend solely thereon. For as we are not called to judge of the being of their constitution, as to the substance of it, unless they are openly judged in the Scripture, as in the case of idolatry and persecution persisted in; so a determination of the truth of their constitution, or that they are true churches, will not presently resolve us in our duty, as to communion with them—It is most unwarrantable rashness and presumption; yea, an evident fruit of ignorance, or want of love, or secular private interest, when, upon lesser differences, men judge churches to be no true churches, and their ministers to be no true ministers†.' The same excellent author says; 'There is nothing more clear and certain, than that our Lord Jesus Christ—never joined with [the Jews] in the observance of their own traditions and pharisaical

*tura doctrinae fidei, et omnia cedere debent, Charras, Apostolos, Angelus e celo. Comment in Epist. ad Galat.* \* See my *Apology for the Baptists.* † *Discon* Je on Evangelical Love, and Church-Peace, p. 82, 83, 84. See *Plain Reasons for Dissenting from the Church of England, Part I. Reason 1.* and STAFFER'S *Theolog. Polem.* Tom. I. p. 518.

' impositions,

## T H E E N D

‘impositions, but warned all his disciples to avoid them and refuse them; whose example we desire to follow: for, concerning all such observances in the church, he pronounced that sentence, *Every plant that my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up*\*.’

It is against what the author considers as an erroneous sentiment, and a corruption of worship, that the following Examination of Pædobaptism makes its appearance: *errors*, not *persons*, are here opposed. He thinks with Mr. LEIGH, that we should ‘distinguish between loving of men’s persons, and their errors†’ and, with Bp. BURNET, that ‘whatever moderation or charity we may owe to men’s persons, we owe none at all to their errors, and to that frame which is built on, and supported by them‡.’ Nay, as Dr. WATERLAND in another case observes, ‘While we are of a contrary judgment, it cannot but be guilty practice and conduct in us, and very great too, to smother our sentiments, or not to bear our testimony in such a way as Christ has appointed, against all notorious corruptions, either of faith, or worship, or doctrine§.’

Should this Examination of Pædobaptism have the honour of being regarded as deserving an Answer, and should any of our opposers write against me; it will not avail to refute some particular parts of the work, detached from the general principles on which I proceed. No; the *data*, the *principal grounds* of reasoning, which are adopted from Pædobaptists themselves, must be constantly kept in view; or nothing to

\* *Enquiry into Orig. and Nature of Churches*, p. 253. † *Treatise of Relig. and Learning*, B. I. Chap. vii. ‡ In Mr ROBINSON’S *Plan of Lectures*, Motto. § *Importance of Doctr. of Trinity*, p. 135.

## **THE HONOUR OF INFANT SPRINKLING WILL BE EFFECTED.**

the grand principles on which my argumentation proceeds, and whence my general conclusions are drawn, are those of Protestants when contending with Papists, and those of Nonconformists when disputing with English Episcopalians; it will be incumbent on such opposer to show, either that the principles themselves are false, or that my reasoning upon them is inconclusive. Now as I do not perceive how any Protestant can give up those principles, without virtually admitting the superstitions of Popery; nor how they can be deserted by any Dissenter, without implicitly renouncing his Nonconformity; so I conclude, that the whole force of any opponent must be employed in endeavouring to prove, that I have reasoned inconsequentially from those principles. That this might be easily proved, I am not at present convinced: and whether any of our Pædobaptist Brethren will consider this publication as of sufficient importance to excite such an attempt, is to me uncertain.

To the conclusions inferred from those very numerous concessions which our opposers have made, (and my Reader will find that many of the greatest eminence among them have been the most free in making concessions) it may perhaps be objected: 'Notwithstanding all their concessions, they continued in the profession and practice of Infant baptism.' Granted: but then it should be considered, that this objection is quite futile; because I professedly argue against Pædobaptism, on the Principles, Reasonings, and Concessions of *Pædobaptists*. Besides, though such an exception to my conclusions expresses a fact, yet it pays the consistency of the authors concerned but a poor compliment. In this light similar concessions from Roman Catholics have always been viewed by

# PREFACE

by Protestants; of which the Reader will meet with various instances in the course of this work\*.

Being fully persuaded that I appear in defence of a divine institution and of apostolic practice, I earnestly commend this publication to the blessing of that Sublime Being, who *worketh all things after the counsel of his will*. Sincerely praying, that evangelical truth and experimental religion, that purity of worship and the practice of holiness, may flourish among all denominations of Christians, I conclude in the following words of Lord BACON 'Read, not to contradict, nor to confute, nor to believe and take for granted, nor to find fault and discourse, but to weigh and conclude.'

JOHN FREL,  
1, 8, 1787

A. BOOTH.

\* See p. 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 316, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, 325, 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 332, 333, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348, 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 362, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 384, 385, 386, 387, 388, 389, 390, 391, 392, 393, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421, 422, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 429, 430, 431, 432, 433, 434, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 460, 461, 462, 463, 464, 465, 466, 467, 468, 469, 470, 471, 472, 473, 474, 475, 476, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 486, 487, 488, 489, 490, 491, 492, 493, 494, 495, 496, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, 506, 507, 508, 509, 510, 511, 512, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 520, 521, 522, 523, 524, 525, 526, 527, 528, 529, 530, 531, 532, 533, 534, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 557, 558, 559, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 565, 566, 567, 568, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 587, 588, 589, 590, 591, 592, 593, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, 599, 600, 601, 602, 603, 604, 605, 606, 607, 608, 609, 610, 611, 612, 613, 614, 615, 616, 617, 618, 619, 620, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625, 626, 627, 628, 629, 630, 631, 632, 633, 634, 635, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 644, 645, 646, 647, 648, 649, 650, 651, 652, 653, 654, 655, 656, 657, 658, 659, 660, 661, 662, 663, 664, 665, 666, 667, 668, 669, 670, 671, 672, 673, 674, 675, 676, 677, 678, 679, 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, 686, 687, 688, 689, 690, 691, 692, 693, 694, 695, 696, 697, 698, 699, 700, 701, 702, 703, 704, 705, 706, 707, 708, 709, 710, 711, 712, 713, 714, 715, 716, 717, 718, 719, 720, 721, 722, 723, 724, 725, 726, 727, 728, 729, 730, 731, 732, 733, 734, 735, 736, 737, 738, 739, 740, 741, 742, 743, 744, 745, 746, 747, 748, 749, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 758, 759, 760, 761, 762, 763, 764, 765, 766, 767, 768, 769, 770, 771, 772, 773, 774, 775, 776, 777, 778, 779, 780, 781, 782, 783, 784, 785, 786, 787, 788, 789, 790, 791, 792, 793, 794, 795, 796, 797, 798, 799, 800, 801, 802, 803, 804, 805, 806, 807, 808, 809, 810, 811, 812, 813, 814, 815, 816, 817, 818, 819, 820, 821, 822, 823, 824, 825, 826, 827, 828, 829, 830, 831, 832, 833, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838, 839, 840, 841, 842, 843, 844, 845, 846, 847, 848, 849, 850, 851, 852, 853, 854, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 860, 861, 862, 863, 864, 865, 866, 867, 868, 869, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 879, 880, 881, 882, 883, 884, 885, 886, 887, 888, 889, 890, 891, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 900, 901, 902, 903, 904, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914, 915, 916, 917, 918, 919, 920, 921, 922, 923, 924, 925, 926, 927, 928, 929, 930, 931, 932, 933, 934, 935, 936, 937, 938, 939, 940, 941, 942, 943, 944, 945, 946, 947, 948, 949, 950, 951, 952, 953, 954, 955, 956, 957, 958, 959, 960, 961, 962, 963, 964, 965, 966, 967, 968, 969, 970, 971, 972, 973, 974, 975, 976, 977, 978, 979, 980, 981, 982, 983, 984, 985, 986, 987, 988, 989, 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000.



# C O N T E N T S.

## VOLUME THE FIRST.

- CHAPTER I. *Concerning the Nature, Obligation, and Importance of Positive Institutions in Religion,* p. 3—43
- CHAP. II. *Concerning the Signification of the Terms, Baptize, and Baptism,* p. 44—146
- CHAP. III. *The Design of Baptism; or, the Facts and Blessings represented by it, both in regard to our Lord and his Disciples,* p. 147—190
- CHAP. IV. *The Practice of John the Baptist, of the Apostles, and of the Church in succeeding Ages, in regard to the Manner of administering the Ordinance of Baptism,* p. 191—266
- CHAP. V. *The present Practice of the Greek and Oriental Churches, in regard to the Mode of Administration,* p. 267—272
- CHAP. VI. *The Design of Baptism more fully expressed by Immersion, than by Pouring or Sprinkling,* p. 273—281
- CHAP. VII. *The Reasons, Rise, and Prevalence of Pouring, or of Sprinkling, instead of Immersion,* p. 282—334

## VOLUME THE SECOND.

- CHAPTER I. *No Express Precept, nor Plain Example, for Pædobaptism in the New Testament,* p. 3—75
- CHAP. II. *No Evidence of Pædobaptism, before the latter End of the Second, or the Beginning of the Third Century,* p. 76—125
- VOL. I. a CHAP.



## XXIV C O N T E N T S.

**CHAP. III.** *The high Opinion of the Fathers concerning the Utility of Baptism, and the Grounds on which they proceeded in administering that Ordinance to Infants, when Pædobaptism became a prevailing Practice,* - - - p. 126—160

**CHAP. IV.** *Concerning the Modern Grounds of Pædobaptism; namely, Jewish Proselyte Baptism—External Covenant Relation—Jewish Circumcision—Particular Passages of Scripture—and Apostolic Tradition.*

**SECTION I.** *Jewish Proselyte Baptism,* p. 162—197

**SECT. II:** *External Covenant Relation,* p. 198—237

**SECT. III.** *Jewish Circumcision,* p. 237—269

**SECT. IV.** *Particular Passages of Scripture: viz.*

§ I. Matt. xxviii. 19. - p. 269—310

§ II. Gen. xvii. 7. - p. 310—330

§ III. Ezek. xvi. 20, 21. - p. 331—336

§ IV. Matt. xix. 14. - p. 336—344

§ V. John iii. 5. - p. 344—350

§ VI. Acts ii. 39. - p. 350—358

§ VII. Acts xvi. 15, 33. 1 Cor. i. 16. p. 358—367

§ VIII. Rom. xi. 16. - p. 368—371

§ IX. 1 Cor. vii. 14. - p. 372—416

**SECT. V.** *Apostolic Tradition,* - p. 419—441

**CHAP. V.** *Infant Baptism, and Infant Communion, Introduced about the same Time, and Supported by similar Arguments,* - p. 442—472

*General Remarks,* - p. 472—542

# I N D E X

*To Quotations from the Writings of Modern Papadapists,  
contained in the following Work.*

N. B. The Second Volume is denoted by ii.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>A</b> DAIR ii. 36<br/>           Addington 93, 180, 181.<br/>             ii. 69, 101, 322, 340, 354, 369<br/>           Ainsworth ii. 522<br/>           — Robert 122<br/>           A Lapide 103, 164<br/>           Allix ii. 431, 504, 505<br/>           Alfop 30, 74, 77, 112, 145, 215,<br/>             247. ii. 13, 30, 40, 61, 176,<br/>             267, 289, 317, 318, 418, 506,<br/>             507.<br/>           Alstedius 61, 273<br/>           Altingius 49, 161, 203, 275, 284.<br/>             ii. 436<br/>           Altmannus 214, 294<br/>           Ambros ii. 139<br/>           Ames ii. 151, 242, 311, 374, 489<br/>           Andradius ii. 8<br/>           Anonymous 8, 36. ii. 19, 34, 217,<br/>             221<br/>             — 54, 101, 111, 260. ii.<br/>               84<br/>             — 60<br/>             — 71, 99, 267, 271, 290,<br/>               ii. 536<br/>             — 100<br/>             — 144<br/>             — 165<br/>             — 171, 271<br/>             — 191<br/>             — 229. ii. 60, 157, 422<br/>             — 328<br/>             — 314. ii. 8, 293, 294,<br/>               337, 493, 500<br/>             — ii. 9<br/>             — ii. 19<br/>             — ii. 420, 527<br/>             — ii. 35, 287<br/>             — ii. 47, 492, 496<br/>             — ii. 50<br/>             — ii. 36, 37, 181<br/>             — ii. 39<br/>             — ii. 45, 140, 192, 195,<br/>               312, 492<br/>             — ii. 65, 125<br/>             — ii. 182<br/>             — ii. 250<br/>             — ii. 365</p> | <p>Anonymous ii. 461<br/>           — ii. 478<br/>           — ii. 492<br/>           — ii. 496<br/>           — ii. 505<br/>           — ii. 532<br/>           Appolonius ii. 394<br/>           Arnolds ii. 289<br/>           Assembly of Divines 208. ii. 137,<br/>             312, 322, 331<br/>           Bacon 214<br/>           Bailey 62<br/>           Balgny 171<br/>           Ball ii. 239<br/>           Barcroft ii. 487<br/>           Barrow 166. ii. 273, 318, 417<br/>           Bafnagius ii. 111, 112<br/>           Bate 116. ii. 180, 194, 404<br/>           Baxter 149, 178, 206, 261, 263,<br/>             266, 286, 320. ii. 4, 11, 29, 44,<br/>             52, 93, 150, 151, 212, 226, 227,<br/>             238, 264, 267, 270, 288, 298,<br/>             311, 322, 334, 335, 371, 391,<br/>             414, 452, 469, 488, 489, 498,<br/>             495, 529<br/>             — Benj. ii. 481<br/>           Beattie ii. 516<br/>           Beckmanus 47. ii. 273<br/>           Bellamy ii. 471<br/>           Bellarmine 25, 26, 280, 326. ii.<br/>             26, 102, 115, 150<br/>           Bengelius 173, 188. ii. 338, 384,<br/>             403, 408<br/>           Bennet 111. ii. 487<br/>             — William, ii. 42, 219, 220<br/>           Benfon ii. 175, 531<br/>           Bentley 45, 211<br/>           Beza 46, 201. ii. 164, 312, 385,<br/>             391, 489, 492<br/>           Bingham 95, 135, 136, 201, 254,<br/>             323, 333. ii. 91, 107, 108, 109,<br/>             142, 349, 412, 425, 438, 474,<br/>             496, 499<br/>           Bishop ii. 81<br/>           Bisset 333<br/>           Blacklock ii. 145<br/>           Blackstone 86, 107<br/>             a 2<br/>           Blackwall</p> |
|--|--|

xxvi. INDEX to Quotations from Writings of Modern Ecclesiasts.

Blackwall ii. 24  
 Blake 180, 226, 311. ii. 220, 238,  
 288, 293, 337, 365, 385, 494  
 Bochartus 174  
 Boernerus ii. 170  
 Bohemius, Johannes, ii. 77  
 Bolducius ii. 180  
 Bona ii. 418  
 Boffuet 53, 209, 249, 303, 304,  
 305. ii. 68, 436, 487  
 Boston ii. 6, 49  
 Botfaccus 153  
 Bower 197  
 Boys 154  
 Bradbury 111, 311. ii. 145, 151,  
 152, 266, 342, 350, 487  
 Brandt ii. 78, 432, 482  
 Braunius 161, 186, 208  
 Brett 119  
 Briskow ii. 429  
 Brooke ii. 44, 239, 378  
 Brown ii. 179  
 Bucanus 47, 156, 318. ii. 96  
 Buddeus 4, 45, 71, 78, 153, 184,  
 201, 238, 249, 267, 276, 311,  
 321. ii. 31, 138, 147, 178, 404,  
 438, 446, 473, 474, 488, 497,  
 503  
 Biegenhagius 90  
 Burkitt 156, 188, 195. ii. 142, 337  
 Burmannus 48, 159, 200  
 Burnet 6, 95, 207, 286, 301, 307.  
 ii. 3, 107, 277, 419, 442, 469,  
 512  
 Butler 4  
 — Samuel, ii. 215  
 Buxtorfius ii. 143  
 Cajetanus 164  
 Calmet 49  
 Calovius ii. 292, 326, 379  
 Calvin 46, 191, 320. ii. 267, 272,  
 301, 331, 358, 496  
 Camerarius 201. ii. 372  
 Camero 288. ii. 372  
 Canus ii. 429  
 Capito ii. 79  
 Carpozivius ii. 169, 177, 197, 250,  
 348  
 Caryl ii. 19  
 Casaubonus 49, 102  
 Castilio 157, 201  
 Cattenburgh ii. 78, 124, 242, 276  
 Caudrey ii. 7

Cave 162, 208, 276. ii. 158  
 Cellarius ii. 10  
 Chambers 210. ii. 77, 209, 436  
 Chamleus 9, 39, 71, 136, 153,  
 180, 214, 241, 255, 300, 323.  
 ii. 31, 63, 100, 104, 121, 189,  
 197, 242, 301, 316, 318, 346,  
 380, 381, 398, 440, 497  
 Chandler 64  
 Chardin 319  
 Charnock 85, 316, 330. ii. 19,  
 266, 344, 465  
 Chauncy 23. ii. 219  
 Chemnitius 25, 257, 278, 324. ii.  
 32, 52, 109, 159, 497  
 Cheyne 313  
 Chillingworth ii. 16, 20, 105,  
 157, 444, 530  
 Clagett 9. ii. 87, 115, 341  
 Clarke 163, 274, 300. ii. 238  
 Clarkson 328. ii. 292  
 Claude ii. 17, 81, 217, 387, 423  
 Cleaveland 84, 135. ii. 35, 393  
 Clerc, Le, 59, 212. ii. 83, 84  
 Clignetius 52, 199  
 Cloppenburg ii. 480  
 Corceius 168. ii. 47  
 Collings ii. 18, 301  
 Colomehus ii. 83  
 Confession of Augsburg ii. 137, 216  
 ——— Basil ii. 216  
 ——— Belgium ii. 216  
 ——— Bohemia ii. 136  
 ——— English Church ii.  
 216  
 ——— French Churches ii.  
 216  
 Confession of Greek Church ii. 135  
 ——— Helvetia 196, 270.  
 ii. 196, 216  
 ——— Saxony 270. ii. 137.  
 216  
 ——— Sueveland 156. ii.  
 137, 216  
 ——— Wittenburg ii. 137  
 Constantinus 63  
 Cotelcrius ii. 438  
 Cotton ii. 212, 366  
 ——— John, ii. 218, 274  
 Council of Cassel ii. 295  
 ——— Paris ii. 83  
 ——— Trent 131, 135. iii.  
 135, 145, 333, 498  
 Creilly ii. 416

- Crocius ii. 319  
 Cunæus ii. 328  
 Curcellæus 203. ii. 76, 432  
 Cusanus 136. ii. 292, 307  
 Cyril ii. 135  
 Daille 174, 196, 276. ii. 98, 121, 473  
 Danæus 45  
 Danish Catechism 46  
 Danzius 59. ii. 190  
 D'Assigny ii. 489  
 Davenant 154, 192. ii. 387  
 Davenport ii. 212  
 De Courcy 48, 55, 208. ii. 35, 475  
 De Graffius ii. 68  
 Deylingius 58, 135, 217, 267, 282, 295, 311. ii. 95, 108, 132, 138, 165, 185, 187, 348, 474, 488, 490  
 Dietericus ii. 374  
 Diodati 49  
 Ditton 257  
 Doddridge 1, 59, 74, 79, 91, 103, 121, 210, 255. ii. 32, 33, 34, 48, 102, 176, 189, 269, 300, 337, 351, 359, 364, 368, 391, 392, 395, 404, 406, 530, 539  
 Dorrington ii. 179, 213  
 D'Outreinius, or Doulin, 171, 199, 250. ii. 48  
 Dryden 123  
 Du Pin ii. 29, 87, 97, 98  
 Dupont 141  
 Durell ii. 181  
 Dutch Annotators 215  
 Edwards, John, 76, 114, 166. ii. 293, 317, 318, 416, 446  
 ——— Jonathan, 6. ii. 48, 153, 198, 321, 502  
 ——— Dr. Jonathan, 72  
 Ellis ii. 17  
 Ellys ii. 423  
 England, Church of, 161, 269, 303. ii. 96, 131, 137, 434, 513  
 Episcopius ii. 78, 129, 275  
 Erasmus ii. 6, 415  
 Erskine 302. ii. 50, 241, 250  
 Ertius 202, 274. ii. 310  
 Evans 309  
 Faber 56  
 Fabricius, F. 321. ii. 326  
 ——— J. R. 93, 486  
 ——— J. A. ii. 124, 127  
 ——— J. L. ii. 495  
 Featley ii. 141  
 Fell 215  
 Ferguson ii. 285  
 Fiddes 3. ii. 139, 496  
 Field ii. 7  
 Findlay 319  
 Fisher ii. 21  
 Floyer 287, 312, 313  
 Forbelius 248  
 Formey 283. ii. 76  
 Fowler 163  
 Foxe 254  
 Franciscus a Sancta Clara 184  
 Frankelius ii. 504  
 Frankius 149  
 Franklin 314  
 Freeman ii. 6, 275, 392  
 Fulke ii. 473  
 Fuller ii. 3  
 Gataker 186. ii. 351  
 Gay 239  
 Gee ii. 140  
 Gerard 41  
 Gerhardus 9, 60, 153. ii. 138, 164, 228, 268, 315, 318, 320, 322, 369, 386  
 ——— J. E. ii. 474, 480  
 Gibson ii. 433  
 Glassius ii. 504  
 Gomarus 45. ii. 108, 277  
 Goodman 7. ii. 107  
 Goodwin 19, 150. ii. 49, 212, 287, 496  
 Grade 52  
 Grosvenor 11  
 Grotius 103, 155, 186, 200, 284, ii. 97, 132, 179, 270  
 Guise 237  
 Gurtlerus 44, 192  
 Gussietius 115  
 Hackspanius ii. 374  
 Ha 154  
 ——— Archibald, 25, 28, 33, 35, 238, 322. ii. 33, 134, 218, 255, 396  
 Hammond 57, 164, 186, 214, 241. ii. 237, 270, 351, 358, 493  
 Hardy 166, 217  
 ——— a 3  
 Harris

# **INDEX to Quotations from the Works of Modern Padoisaptists,**

- Harris** ii. 205  
**Hafæus** 205  
**Hafselquist** 267  
**Hebden** ii. 26, 267  
**Hedericus** 63, 139  
**Heidanus** 202  
**Heideggerus** 59, 265, 188, 217, 274, 300, 322, ii. 9, 179, 275, 327, 346, 355, 443, 495  
**Heineccius** 40. ii. 56, 299  
**Henry** 228, 259, 271, 293, 297, 304, 318, 330. ii. 25, 124, 219, 213, 214, 229, 238, 296, 315, 321, 333, 358, 369, 385, 409, 422, 489, 493  
 ———'s Continuators; ii. 408  
**Hervey** 79, 333, ii. 521  
**Hoadly** 16, 110, 283. ii. 264, 284  
**Holland** ii. 78  
**Homes** ii. 212  
**Hoornbeekius** 38, 48, 258, 296, 284. ii. 50, 71, 271, 474  
**Hopkins** 273. ii. 17  
**Morsey** 103, 129, 238, 327, 328. ii. 363, 500, 501  
**Horsley** 72, 77  
**Hofius** ii. 477  
**Hofpinianus** 49, 203. ii. 129, 422, 424  
**Hottingerus** ii. 260  
**Huetius** ii. 100  
**Hughes** ii. 32, 106, 382  
**Hulsius** 188, 216  
**Hunnus** ii. 488  
**Hunter** 178, 316  
**Hurd** ii. 18  
**Hursi** ii. 44  
**Hutchinson** ii. 179  
  
**Jennings** ii. 172, 254  
**Jewel** ii. 478  
**Jkenius** 57. ii. 414  
**Johnson** 123  
**Jurieu** 211  
**Iustinianus** ii. 373  
  
**Keckermannus** 51, 286  
**Keldermannus** ii. 176  
**King** 205  
 ——— Dr. 6, 254, 268, 269  
**Knechtbull** 168, 183. ii. 166, 493  
  
**Lampe** 160, 202, 293. ii. 164, 424  
**Latomus** 283  
  
**Laurentius** 180  
**Leigh** 62, 217, 273. ii. 5, 218, 316, 368, 382  
**Leighton** 260. ii. 327, 494  
**Lelapd** ii. 531  
**Lenfant** 191  
**Lewis** 87  
**Leydeckerus** ii. 430  
**Leyden Professors** ii. 384  
**Lightfoot** ii. 179, 288, 264, 265  
**Limborch** 48, 257, 202. ii. 5, 47, 80, 151, 240, 276, 352, 359, 476  
**Locke** 225, 218. ii. 164  
**Lucas Brugensis** ii. 276  
**Luther** 50, 163, 184. ii. 4, 188, 497  
  
**Maccovius** ii. 272  
**Magdeburg Centuriators** 41, 54, 214. ii. 6, 98  
**Mairburg** ii. 481  
**Manton** 161, 288  
**Marchant** 248, 254  
**Marckius** 189, 198  
**Marloratus** 195  
**Marshall** ii. 3, 18, 474  
 ——— Walter, 153. ii. 144  
**Marsham** ii. 178  
**Martin** 200  
**Martyr** 21, 167. ii. 885  
**Mastricht** 255, 180, 193, 275. ii. 19, 217  
**Mather** 329. ii. 219  
**Mather, Moses**, ii. 257  
**Mayo** 279. ii. 18, 21, 71, 72, 475  
**Mede** 208  
**Meierus** ii. 47, 48  
**Meisnerus** 46  
**Melanchton** ii. 374, 496  
**Menochius** 103. 202, 368  
**Meshovius** ii. 479  
**Meyerus** ii. 178  
**Middleton** 239  
**Millar** 267. ii. 31  
**Milton** 123  
**Mintert** 63, 122. ii. 73  
**Momma** 165, 206  
**Montesquieu** 105, 322  
**Morrice** ii. 322, 354  
**Morus** 275  
**Mosheim** 108. ii. 95, 124, 446  
**Mumford** ii. 68  
**Musculus** ii. 217, 378

- Neal 95. ii. 106, 424, 433, 538  
 Newton ii. 29, 67  
 — Dr. 129, 193  
 Nichols 285, 325. ii. 418, 430,  
 434, 439  
 Nicholson 164, 219  
 Œcolampadius ii. 9  
 Œderus ii. 290  
 Olwald 330  
 Ottius ii. 107  
 Owen 4, 23, 26, 34, 36, 39, 46,  
 71, 75, 78, 100, 111, 177, 178,  
 228, 303, 317, 334. ii. 15, 17,  
 19, 34, 37, 41, 53, 55, 73, 107,  
 129, 154, 161, 171, 194, 238,  
 254, 255, 256, 275, 287, 304,  
 312, 327, 344, 360, 430, 438,  
 439, 465, 504  
 — Mr. 307. ii. 33, 52, 242,  
 298, 487  
 Oxford Divines ii. 10  
 Paley ii. 283  
 Palmer ii. 5, 280  
 Pamelius 284  
 Paræus ii. 267, 311, 385  
 Parkhurst 62, 119, 122. ii. 73, 365  
 Pascal ii. 511  
 Paſor 62, 139. ii. 365  
 Patrick 47, 152, 188, 194, 250.  
 ii. 274, 359  
 Payne 25, 32, 230, 257. ii. 317,  
 430  
 Pearce 205  
 Peirce 325. ii. 18, 99, 108, 122,  
 319, 429, 434, 439, 452, 463,  
 464  
 Perkins 217, 274, 283. ii. 494  
 Peronet ii. 350  
 Peter a Soto ii. 38  
 Pfeifferus ii. 176  
 Philips P. 212  
 Picart 282. ii. 251  
 Pictetus 154, 192, 275  
 Piscator 193, 286.  
 Placcus 92  
 Polhill 24, 152. ii. 15  
 Poliandrus ii. 496  
 Poole ii. 318, 416, 419, 505  
 —'s Continuators 60, 187,  
 197. ii. 272, 336, 372, 409  
 Pope 247  
 Porteus ii. 34  
 Potter 92, 110  
 Prideaux ii. 7, 212, 495  
 Priestley 200. ii. 239, 447, 502  
 Puffendorf 315  
 Quenstedius 116, 220, 285, 318.  
 ii. 99, 108, 109  
 Ramſay ii. 303, 304  
 Rathband ii. 323  
 Ravanellus 198  
 Reeves 2, 98, 225, 326. ii. 35, 304  
 Reid 99  
 Reisklus 59  
 Reynolds 37  
 — Ep. 45  
 Rhenſerdus ii. 179  
 Ricaut 268  
 Ridgley 23, 110, 229. ii. 28, 278  
 Ridley 203  
 Rigaltius 165. ii. 78, 98  
 Ruſſenius 285. ii. 46  
 Rivetus ii. 100, 323, 496  
 Robertson 63  
 — Dr. 254  
 Robins 265  
 Robiſon ii. 419  
 — John, ii. 391  
 Roell 48, 159, 218. ii. 218  
 Rogers 56. ii. 432  
 — J. 273  
 Roque, De la, 331. ii. 5, 77  
 Rgis 153  
 Rus ii. 170  
 Ruſh ii. 504  
 Ruſſen ii. 479  
 Rutherford ii. 49, 322, 410  
 Sale ii. 180  
 Salmaſius 44, 197, 282. ii. 76,  
 128, 444  
 Salmero 226, 255 327. ii. 103,  
 373, 429  
 Sanderſon ii. 7, 151  
 Saurin 150, 318. ii. 187, 229,  
 274, 502  
 Scapula 63  
 Scharpius ii. 388  
 Schaubius ii. 74  
 Schelhornius 50, 71, 99  
 Schickardus ii. 178  
 Schmidius 56. ii. 415  
 Schottgenius 62, 158  
 Schotanus ii. 17  
 Schrevelius

xxx INDEX to Quotations from Writings of Modern *Radobaptists*,

- Schrevelius 62, 139  
 Schwarzius 64, 86, 139. ii. 74,  
 407, 507  
 Seckendorff ii. 478  
 Scott 170. ii. 142  
 — Daniel, 53, 65  
 Scudder 152  
 Scultetus ii. 98  
 Secker 193, 316  
 Selden 51. ii. 165  
 Shaw 248. ii. 499  
 Sherlock 7, 20, 35, 72, 73, 314.  
 ii. 284, 287, 342  
 — Thomas, ii. 168  
 Smalcald, Articles of, 60  
 Smyth 323  
 Spanhemius 47, 67, 194, 285  
 — F. 205  
 Spencer ii. 178  
 Spenerus 184  
 Sperlingius ii. 179  
 Stackhouse 195  
 Stapferus 48, 159, 179, 271. ii.  
 5, 136, 439  
 Staphilus ii. 10  
 Steele 6, 257, 299, 301. ii. 19  
 Stephanus 63, 139  
 Stillingfleet 108, 215. ii. 7, 197,  
 440, 509  
 Stockius 63  
 Stoddard ii. 153  
 Stratford ii. 32, 158  
 Suares ii. 373  
 Suicerus 53, 92. ii. 76, 129, 444  
 Swift ii. 319  
 Synod of Dordt ii. 340, 488  
 — French Protestants ii.  
 328, 494  
 —, in New England, ii. 492,  
 494  
 Taylor 116. ii. 404  
 — Bp. 1, 36, 43, 72, 112,  
 168, 169, 249, 294, 300. ii.  
 18, 25, 35, 117, 420, 428, 448,  
 465, 540  
 Thyfius ii. 496  
 Tilnius 158  
 Tillotson 105, 228. ii. 31, 159,  
 486  
 Titinius 103  
 Toletus 215. ii. 368  
 Towerfon 51, 171, 209, 286. ii. 7  
 Towgood 317. ii. 95, 435, 489  
 Trapp 48, 200  
 Trompius 62  
 Tull ii. 496  
 Turretinus 28, 55, 77, 110, 151,  
 288, 300, 329. ii. 34, 47, 48,  
 105, 158, 238, 425, 438, 455  
 — J. A. 25. ii. 419  
 Twells 202. ii. 99  
 Twisse ii. 212, 310  
 Urfinus ii. 49  
 Usher 206  
 Valefius 294  
 Valques 296. ii. 373, 381  
 Vatablus ii. 372  
 Velthufius ii. 323, 373  
 Venema 54, 96, 134, 174, 212,  
 267, 286 ii. 49, 79, 124, 126,  
 164, 203, 243, 268, 278, 35  
 388, 447, 473, 475, 478, 495,  
 513  
 Vitringa 47. ii. 156, 194. ii. 5,  
 25, 45, 98, 126, 198, 218, 261,  
 268, 375, 495, 503  
 Vives ii. 76  
 Voetius 260  
 Vossius 55, 162, 204, 275, 329.  
 ii. 93, 98, 139, 274, 356  
 Wadsworth 38  
 Waeyn 117 ii. 187  
 Wagenfelius ii. 250  
 Wake ii. 27  
 Walæus 60, 283. ii. 217, 496  
 Walker 219. ii. 8  
 Wall 220, 261, 265, 268, 270,  
 277, 288, 313, 332. ii. 3, 45,  
 85, 96, 101, 113, 129, 150, 253,  
 290, 414, 473  
 Warden ii. 267  
 Warren ii. 335  
 Waterland 26, 37, 39, 73, 145,  
 236, 317. ii. 50, 140  
 Wats ii. 118  
 Watts ii. 45, 50, 319  
 Weemse 208  
 Wells 166  
 Werenfelsius 70, 109  
 Wernsdorff ii. 176  
 Wesley 41, 196, 238. ii. 143  
 West ii. 79  
 Weston ii. 99  
 Wetham 287  
 Wetstenius 59, 218  
 Wharton

- |                                    |                                 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Wharton ii. 32, 381                | Witherspoon 34, 330. ii. 516    |
| Whiston ii. 209                    | Withius 44, 102, 147, 188, 186, |
| Whitby 153, 187, 219, 310. ii. 47, | 191, 268, 273, 320. ii. 9, 178, |
| 140, 255, 277, 336, 351, 358,      | 230, 250, 316, 351, 356, 495,   |
| 373, 405                           | 502                             |
| White 36. ii. 15, 308              | Wolfius 162, 183. 204. ii. 315, |
| Whitefield 210. ii. 143            | 375                             |
| Wickliff ii. 431                   | Young 63                        |
| Willet 296, 322. ii. 287           | Zanchius 48, 157, 196, 217. ii. |
| Williams 104. ii. 56, 61, 64, 312, | 287, 311                        |
| 451, 491, 492                      | Zeltnerus 184. ii. 176          |
| Wills ii. 4, 141, 142              | Zepperus 60                     |
| Wilfon 61. ii. 218, 288            | Zuinglius ii. 475               |
| —— Bp. 249. ii. 140                |                                 |
| —— T. 208                          |                                 |
| Wishart ii. 349                    |                                 |

*Authors under the Denomination of QUAKERS.*

- |                                   |                                 |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Barclay 66, 182. ii. 12, 249, 462 | Lawson 68, 224. ii. 13, 47, 82, |
| Bathurst 68. ii. 12               | 360                             |
| Claridge ii. 13                   | Penn 67. ii. 14, 249            |
| Dell 66, 182                      | Phipps 67. ii. 12, 339, 361     |
| Ellwood 66, 224                   | Purver 69. ii. 380              |
| Fothergill 67, 112. ii. 12, 282,  | Whitehead 67. ii. 13, 282       |
| 339, 361                          | Wyeth ii. 36, 37, 282, 462      |
| Gratton 66, 182, 224              |                                 |

*Ancient Fathers, and Ecclesiastical Writers, chiefly produced by Pseudo-baptist Authors, as quoted in this Work.*

- |                                     |                                   |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Ambrose 170. ii. 16, 147, 229       | Gregorius Nazianzenus ii. 128     |
| Austin 180. ii. 118, 120, 129, 420, | Hilmarus ii. 491                  |
| 443, 491, 498                       | Ignatius 169                      |
| Barnabas ii. 184, 185               | Innocent, the Third, ii. 336, 418 |
| Basil 99, 169. ii. 16, 420          | Irenæus ii. 79, 83, 84, 85, 87    |
| —— of Seleucia, 170                 | Jerom ii. 276, 425                |
| Bernard 170, 318. ii. 125           | Justin Martyr 169, 234. ii. 110,  |
| Bonifacius ii. 119                  | 126                               |
| Chrysostom 99, 167, 168, 170,       | Lactantius 170                    |
| ii. 129, 460                        | Leo ii. 425                       |
| Clement Alexandrinus ii. 87, 88,    | Moschus ii. 97                    |
| 420                                 | Nicephorus 295                    |
| —— Romanus, 442. ii. 102            | Origen ii. 101, 189               |
| Clementine Constitutions ii. 279    | Pelagius ii. 236                  |
| Cyprian 84, 294. ii. 127, 147,      | Rupertus ii. 131                  |
| 428, 491                            | Sozomen 325                       |
| Cyril, of Jerusalem, 102            | Tertullian 144, 229. ii. 16, 98,  |
| Damascenus 144                      | 94, 97, 127, 183, 221, 420        |
| Epiphanius 134. ii. 259, 279        | Walafridus Strabo ii. 83          |
| Eusebius 293                        |                                   |



# I N D E X.

## A.

- A** BRAHAM circumcising himself and his household, compared with baptism of the three thousand 251—254 : covenant made with him ii. 310—330
- Addington, grossly mistaken ii. 101 : represents the Baptists as inventing a rite ii. 340
- Ainsworth's apology for Jeroboam ii. 521—526
- Asbati, Candidati, who so called 206
- Alfonfus, his blasphemous saying 39
- Anabaptist, a name of unjust reproach ii. 473
- Analogy, between signs and things signified, necessary 179—183 : analogical reasoning not agreeable to positive institutions ii. 262, 340, 511—527, 516, 517
- Angels, two, perform the office of sponsors ii. 97
- Apostles did not refuse to baptize, because of any trouble attending it 235 : not the authors of a certain Creed ii. 27 : paedobaptism not known by them 154—157
- Arians, their evasion respecting XXXIX Articles 141 : never use language of Trinitarians 236
- Articles, XXXIX, not designedly obscure 112—114
- Arnoldists, ii. 125
- Austin's defence of sponsors refuted ii. 120—122

## B.

- Babel, of Anabaptists, and of Paedobaptists ii. 504
- Baptism ; a Greek term Anglicised 87 : signifies immersion, not swimming on the surface, nor sinking to the bottom 44, 46, 49, 55, 56, 69 : an ordinance highly honoured 41 : not to be neglected 13, 147. ii. 149, 538 : will of God respecting it fully revealed 24. ii. 62 : explained by John's practice 52, 193, 224, 275 : and by that of the Ancients 44—48, 149, 152—176, 191—224, 230. ii. 63 : a single action 107, 129, 185 : always in, or into, 67, 89, 100, 103, 174 : figurative 44, 45, 57, 59, 62, 67, 89, 90, 100—103, 200, 273 : the term not obscure 82, 105—111, 125, 131—133 : primary sense not to be deserted 81, 97, 98, 122—125 : manner of using water not a circumstance 125—130 : no other word more proper to signify immersion 138—146 : why Christ was baptized 147, 148, 149 : antitype of the deluge 175 : its design fully expressed by immersion 273—278 : pretence of baptism without water 295, 296 : of the three thousand 248—257 : not an ordinance partly moral ii. 57 : instances of eminent persons, descended from Christian parents, baptized when adults ii. 116, 117, 118 : denominated, by some Paedobaptists, a sheep-mark, and an ear-mark ii. 142 : not a seal of the covenant ii. 264—269 : a solemn act of worship ii. 304—307 : belief of its being necessary to salvation followed by absurd practices ii. 348—350 : practical improvement of it ii. 533—537
- Baptists reproached and falsely accused 221, 258, 259, 260. ii. 474 : the charge refuted 259, 260, 263—266 : censured for depreciating baptism ii. 147 : not descended from the Munster insurgents, but rather from the Waldensian confessors ii. 476—480 : infamous attempt to render them odious ii. 481, 482 : theirs the safer side ii. 527—530

**Baptistery** 47, 199, 217 : at first a pond, or a river 235  
**Bahns**, when first used at the administration of baptism 290 : never mentioned as so employed by the Apostles 231, 232

**Bathing**, cold, 313, 314.

**Baxter** never saw a child sprinkled 207 : acknowledges infant baptism is dark in scripture, ii. 45

**Believers**, not all baptized in the Holy Spirit 101

**Bible**, our only rule 22, 25, 26. ii. 16—21

**Bishops and Presbyters** ii. 439

**Blasphemy**, to suppose God's laws cannot be understood 111

C.

**Calvin's Form of administering baptism**, first ordered pouring 289, 290

**Candidati**, who, 206

**Cant. vii. 2.** produced as decisively for infant baptism ii. 416, 417

**Cares**, baptized in them, 99

**Carnal descent**, not included in the law of baptism ii. 72 : none holy in virtue of it ii. 387 : not of any force under the gospel ii. 314, 328, 329, 330

**Catechumens**, who, ii. 76 : received the Lord's supper immediately after baptism, *ibid.*

**Ceremonies appointed of God** not to be neglected 38 : unscriptural, may be an occasion of good ii. 153

**Chancery**, court of, for matters of religion 328, 329

**Children** may be as safely immersed as adults 314 : never said to be baptized ii. 22—29 : how formerly devoted to God ii. 118 : of Christians, to be forcibly baptized, if needful ii. 139

**Christ**, was baptized by immersion 41, 175, 192—199, 203, 206, 208, 209, 210, 212, 214, 218, 220, 221, 224 : why baptized 13, 156, 175, 176 : faithful as Moses 8, 23, 24 : his laws easy to be understood 25, 108, 134 : his example and that of Apostles to be followed 229 : no subjects of his kingdom but real Christians ii. 221 : his kingdom not of this world ii. 222

**Christians**, all who never owned the Papal supremacy, practise immersion 268, 290 : anciently called themselves fishes ii. 91

**Church**, has no power to institute any ceremony 35 : when guilty of spiritual adultery 34, 35 : errors in it have small beginnings 279 : is now become very delicate 324 : definition of it does not include infants ii. 215—219 : Christian, should be well distinguished from the Jewish ii. 253, 264, 391—396 : National, infant membership the basis of ii. 37 : Jewish, ecclesiastico-political ii. 252

**Church-members**, none born to ii. 221—225, 254

**Circumcision**, neglect of, nearly fatal to Moses 38 : directions about it, plain 96 : the word not univocal 115, 116 : might have been evaded by modern reasonings 98, 116, 117, 118 : painful, dangerous, and thought shameful 318—321. ii. 229 : Rabbinical opinion of it ii. 143, 146 : differs from baptism ii. 153, 241, 245 : supposed by some as ancient as Adam ii. 180 : of females ii. 228—230 : baptism did not come in its place ii. 237—247 : proved descent from Abraham, and title to temporal blessings ii. 241, 245, 246, 250 : not a seal of spiritual blessings to Abraham's carnal seed ii. 265, 266 : administered to the dead ii. 348 : Gerhard's notion of its utility ii. 268

Circumstance,

- Circumstance**, manner of using water, not one 125—130: if appointed by God, it is a substantial 30: circumstances of positive ordinances 32, 130. ii. 73
- Clinical baptism** 62, 212, 216, 218, 282, 283, 284, 293: not apostolic 294: necessity urged for it 282, 290, 294: those who received it, not admitted into the ministry: 199, 288, 294: some scrupled to acknowledge them Christians 84, 294
- Command**, fifth, why long life promised to a performance of it ii. 246
- Common Prayer**, altered respecting baptism 270
- Confessions**, Protestant, relating to importance of baptism ii. 136, 137
- Conscience**, erroneous 40
- Councils and Rituals** respecting immersion 195, 210, 213: council of Carthage first made infant baptism necessary ii. 5: forbade baptism and the holy supper to be given to the dead ii. 348: of Constance, prohibited the cup to laity 323, 324: of Cassel, directs how to make infants catechumens ii. 295
- Covenant**, not internal and external ii. 198—208, 373, 377: external, abolished ii. 203—205, 243, 245, 377, 385, 392, 393, 394: present administration of, differs from the Jewish ii. 201, 202, 204, 373, 377: infants of believers, as such, not in it ii. 206—209, 377: contradictory opinions of Pædobaptists concerning it 211—215: interest in, gives no right to baptism ii. 227, 228: gives a title to both supposed seals, or neither ii. 230, 231, 232: federal interest of believers' children a dangerous doctrine ii. 232—237, 395: baptism not a seal of it ii. 266: the death and Spirit of Christ the seals ii. 264, 269
- 1 Cor. vii. 14.** considered: sanctification mentioned relates to matrimonial commerce ii. 372—375, 378, 379, 380, 403: holy, means legitimate 372, 373, 374, 379, 380, 407, 408, 409: relates not to baptism 379—383: no external holiness of children 373, 376, 378, 385: holiness of the child and of its unbelieving parent of the same kind 379, 384: passage wrested, as John vi. by Papists 382, 383: not the holiness of Jewish offspring 384, 410, 411: holiness by descent, how asserted by Pædobaptists and Jews 385—387: plea from this holiness equally proves infant communion 390, 391: sanctified, unclean, holy, how to be understood 391—415: the text affords a presumption infants were not baptized 402: how Pædobaptists explain the term sanctify 404: mistake of Doddridge rectified 406, 407: his inconsistency remarked 395, 396: ways of cleansing from relative impurity, according to Baxter 414
- Cross**, sign of, its virtue, according to some ii. 147, 148
- Cups**, baptism of, 57, 68

D.

- De Courcy**, his opinion of Zanchius 48
- Deistical writer** avails himself of Pædobaptism ii. 530: concessions of his answers ii. 530—533
- Disciple**, to make, and to baptize, different ii. 269, 270, 274, 276, 277—280, 298: disciples and believers the same ii. 270—273, 275, 278, 287, 288, 301: made by teaching ii. 270—279, 282, 287, 288: differently represented to favour infant baptism ii. 271, 278, 280: not two sorts of real disciples ii. 298, 299, 300
- Dipping,

Dipping, pouring, and sprinkling, different actions *ii.* 83, 84  
 Directory, the, changed the font into a basin 289  
 Disobedience to positive institutes inexcusable 289, 290  
 Dissenting Pædobaptists lay great stress on silence of Scripture *ii.*  
 31—34 : inconsistent, when they argue from profelyte baptism *ii.*  
 195, 196, 197 : their argument from circumcision may be retort-  
 ed by Papists *ii.* 261, 262 : inconsistent, respecting tradition *ii.*  
 434—437 : their arguments against Episcopacy may be retorted  
*ii.* 487

Dordt, Synod of, pronounced the dying infants of unbelievers re-  
 probate *ii.* 340 : divided, about baptizing children taken in war  
*ii.* 488

## E.

Eastern churches practise immersion 248, 267, 268, 269  
 Eleft were buried and rose with Christ 190  
 England, Church of, requires immersion 206, 219, 269, 294 : extract  
 from Catechism 269 : members of, retort upon Dissenters for not  
 plunging 307—310 : the clergy would be glad to have immersion  
 restored 333 : animadversions on the Spiritual Cobwebs, by Episco-  
 palian 333 : ministers of it who oppose plunging, contradict  
 their own declared assent 269 : consecrates baptismal water *ii.*  
 131 : how XXVIIth Article stood in the time of Edward VI.  
*ii.* 433 : why Popish ceremonies are retained in it *ii.* 513  
 Episcopacy not mentioned in Scripture *ii.* 25, 26 : defended, as in-  
 fant baptism *ii.* 104, 439  
 Error, baptized in, 59 : innocence of, a pernicious opinion *ii.* 514  
 —522

Eunomians, how they baptized 135 : were Arians 201  
 Eunuch, baptism of, 151, 205, 243, 244, 283. *ii.* 507  
 Evidence, competent, must be received, though attended with dif-  
 ficulties 257  
 Exorcism, very ancient, *ii.* 185, 193  
 External covenant, none *ii.* 198—206

## F.

Faith, a profession of, required of all prior to baptism *ii.* 4, 5, 7,  
 46—50  
 Fathers, ancient, held baptism necessary to salvation *ii.* 126—130 :  
 that unbaptized infants went to a middle place *ii.* 128, 130 : some  
 of them, that baptism confers immortality *ii.* 145 : vicarious pro-  
 fession of faith, infers vicarious baptism *ii.* 121  
 Fearley's fancies and calumnies *ii.* 141  
 Fillipping a wet finger, not baptizing 288  
 Fingers, ministers baptize theirs, rather than the child 51  
 First, in any kind, most perfect 228  
 Free communion 296. *ii.* 514

## G.

Garments, white, not worn by newly baptized persons in apostolic  
 times 206. *ii.* 109  
 Gen. xvii. 7. considered : the promise includes both a carnal and  
 spiritual seed *ii.* 310, 314, 315, 328 : all carnal privileges abo-  
 lished *ii.* 310—315, 320, 321, 328, 329, 330 : ascertains no spiri-  
 tual blessing to Abraham's natural seed, as such *ii.* 310—315, 320,  
 321, 328, 329, 330

**General Rules**; few men allow their own cases to be included in them 43

**Geneva, church of**, followed by the English in laying aside immersion 289, 291

**God's will**, dangerous not to know it 13: the supreme law 329:

**God**, in one mind 308: glorified by keeping his appointments 28, 34: they are not, to us, optional 94: called jealous, with regard to them 34: will bless his own appointments only 34

**Godfathers**, as used by the ancients ii. 76, 77, 78: censured ii. 122, 123: betwixt the cause of infant baptism ii. 123: use of them carries in it an allusion to primitive practice ii. 124

**Gospel church** has as complete a rubric as the Jewish had 23, 24

**Greek church** uses immersion 173, 195, 267, 268, 269, 290: practices trine immersion 267, 268: uses the third person in the form of baptism 267: has a greater extent than the Latin church 269: attributes too much to baptism ii. 136: practices infant communion ii. 136, 445, 448, 452

**Greek particles**, observations upon, 89. ii. 507, 508

**Guise**, his account of John's baptism, exploded 237—247

## H.

**Heifer, red**, for the water of separation 30

**Helvetia**, confession of, respecting immersion 196, 270: importance of baptism ii. 136

**Henry's misrepresentation** censured 271, 272: inconsistent 304. ii. 213, 214, 215: represents baptism as extremely important ii. 244, 245: plan of prayer for infants to believe, censured ii. 233—237

**Heretics**, who did not reject baptism, retained immersion 201: some marked the ears of the baptized with fire ii. 124

**Histopedes**, who, 135

**Holiness** necessary to happiness 11: relative ii. 391

## J.

**Jeroboam**, mock apology for. ii. 519—525

**Jewish purifications** 58: mere water not sprinkled 298: some of their laws have a much greater appearance of indelicacy than immersion 321: parents answerable for the sins of their children to a certain age ii. 411: rabbies, what they say of explaining divine law ii. 504

**Jews**, in proselyte baptism, practiced immersion 195, 200. ii. 190: went thrice a year to Jerusalem 251: their children born members of the ancient church ii. 223, 224, 392: not admitted to Christian baptism on that account ii. 223: they were entitled to communion under the O. T. independent of real holiness ii. 224, 392, 393: almost every thing among them, before the death of Christ, had a relative holiness ii. 394: not so, under the N. T. ii. 395, 396, 412, 413, 414

**Image worship**, how defended ii. 21, 39

**Immersion** (see Baptism) and that only, can represent the great things exhibited in baptism 173: practice of primitive church 44—53, 56—60, 98, 149, 152—176, 191—222, 224, 225, 274—277, 282—290: continued for thirteen centuries 192, 210, 213, 219: daily practiced for purification among the Jews 250: always used by Oriental churches 267, 268, 282, 284, 286: more significant

significant than sprinkling 273—281, 283, 285: why discontinued 282—334: practised in all Christian countries to which papal power never extended 290: in England, till the reign of James I. 287: not indecent, nor dangerous 312, 313, 314, 321: arguments against, resemble those of the Papists in other cases 295—299, 327

Imposition of hands, and unction, not used in connection with baptism by the primitive church ii. 101, 102

Indecent; what God requires, called so at our peril 321

Infant baptism: neither precept nor precedent for it, in the N. T.

ii. 3—10, 12, 13, 14: conjecture and tradition called in to support it ii. 3, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14: must be gathered by consequences

ii. 7, 9, 12: supposed lawful, because not expressly forbidden ii.

9, 35: if appointed of God, the silence of N. T. utterly unaccountable ii. 20—29: if practised by the apostles, why not mentioned as well as infant-circumcision? ii. 26, 27: arguments for it.

Discoverable by the common people ii. 42, 43, 44: would not be so obscure, if a duty ii. 42: remarkable concessions

and concessions, by Pædobaptists ii. 44, 45, 46: unlawful, if not

condemned ii. 51—55: not practised by the primitive church

ii. 82, 83: surprising it is not mentioned more early, if

its origin ii. 103: when first practised (it is objected) it

is proved no more; answered ii. 103, 440: opposed in the

th and twelfth century ii. 124, 125: declared necessary by

a council ii. 129: arose from an opinion of its being essentially

necessary ii. 126, 127, 128: and holy water, patronized

by Pædobaptists ii. 13: more common in Africa than in Asia ii.

133: texts urged for it by moderns, different from those used by

the ancients ii. 132, 135: and adult, compared, as to utility ii.

154: sentiments of some respecting it, tend to inspire with

hope ii. 232—237: adapted to national churches ii. 253:

come instead of infant circumcision ii. 238, 240, 241,

248, 256—264: if it had, complete communion would have

been given to all that were baptized ii. 257: this consequence ad-

mitted by some Pædobaptists ii. 257: would have been men-

tioned in the dispute about circumcision ii. 258, 259: cannot be

derived from both proselyte baptism and circumcision ii. 259:

not a seal of spiritual benefits ii. 266—269: very unhappily cir-

cumstanced ii. 381

Infant communion an ancient practice ii. 442—452: of the same

date with infant baptism ii. 447, 462: became general ii. 445,

446: originated in misunderstanding John vi. 53. ii. 442, 443,

446, 447, 453: esteemed necessary to salvation ii. 442, 443, 446:

privately given to them, when sick ii. 442, 444: always given

immediately after their baptism ii. 442, 444, 446, 447: continued

in the Latin church till transubstantiation occasioned its be-

ing laid aside ii. 445, 447, 448: among the Bohemians, till the

year 1428 ii. 448, 456: infant baptism liable to the same objec-

tions ii. 448, 451: the same answers given ii. 458, 459, 460: in-

far have a legal right to each ii. 451: prudential reasons op-

pose that right, and triumph over it ii. 464—468: now practised

by half the Christian world ii. 445, 448: abridgement of Mr.

Peirce's Essay in defence of it ii. 452—461: never answered by

any Pædobaptist ii. 463

- Infants, if unable to bear immersion, not subjects of baptism 312, 311 : want the necessary qualifications ii. 46—50, 59, 60 : can not covenant with God ii. 151 : know not whether baptized or not, except by testimony ii. 152 : baptized infants, not treated as church members ii. 224, 225 : receive no benefit from the faith of others ii. 237, 282 : two methods of making them disciples ii. 295 : ceremony of dedicating, censured ii. 344
- Inquisitors interpret doubtful laws as they please 135
- Institutions, positive ; divine command the only ground of their observance 1—10, 14—25, 28, 29, 34, 35, 36, 41, 42, 178, 298—302. ii. 8, 11, 17, 18, 19, 38, 367, 390 : determines the matter of them, manner of performance, and signification 1—17, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 52, 300—303, 322—331. ii. 16—19, 390 : cannot be proved by citation 2, 20, 21. ii. 228, 229, 230, 470, 472, 472, 511 : nor from moral fitness 227. ii. 228, 340, 511—527 : nor does imagined utility infer their existence 7, 10, 227. ii. 341, 342, 470 : laws relating to them must be express 3, 6, 7 : full and plain 9, 17—26, 105, 110, 111, 112. ii. 41, 42 : admit not of commutation, alteration, or addition 2, 4, 9, 17, 26, 29—36, 301, 302, 303, 330. ii. 16—19, 239, 512—527 : under the Law, obscure 178 : carnal ii. 254, 255, 256 : arguments from Jewish rites, or from general principles, incompetent 10, 21, 22, 23, 227. ii. 14, 242, 248, 250, 255, 260, 340, 511—527 : their obligation, moral 3. 4, 5, 27, 42 : cannot be neglected without sin 5—8, 41, 42, 106, 227, 302. ii. 53 : wilful ignorance of them dangerous 13, 41 : contempt of them inconsistent with holiness 5, 15, 41, 42, 43 : must be regarded with proper dispositions 15, 20, 37, 177 : are a trial of obedience 2, 6, 37, 42 : in some cases, must give way to moral duties 2, 5, 14, 16, 34 : not arbitrary impositions 15 : corruption of them called whoredom 34 : we must not invent significations for them 179 : resemble what they were designed to represent 180 : better omitted, than practised contrary to appointment 311, 312 : those of the N. T. as obligatory as those of the Old were 327 : positive laws imply their negative ii. 53—56 : qualifications of subjects of baptism, moral ii. 58 : N. T. rites not to be accommodated to O. T. appointments ii. 237, 260—264
- John iii. 5. considered : *water*, there, has no reference to baptism if 133, 134, 344, 345, 346 : to suppose that it has, injurious to divine grace ii. 134 : must be understood mystically ii. 345, 346 : other reasons evincing the same thing *ibid.*
- John practised immersion 52, 66, 67, 68, 89, 283 : thence called the Baptist 59, 65, 224. ii. 181 : the people did not stand in ranks on the brink of Jordan 237—247 : did not baptize infants ii. 3, 12, 46, 47 : account of him from Josephus ii. 173 : the first who practised baptism ii. 162—166, 170—174, 181, 182, 183 : descent from godly ancestors no plea with him ii. 330
- Jenæus not to be understood of infant baptism ii. 80, 83—86
- Justification ; meaning of the term 77
- Justin Martyr mentions the baptism of adults only ii. 79 : would have informed us, if infants had been baptized ii. 113, 114,

Lake, in what sense baptized 54

Laver of regeneration, what 175

Laws never speak but to command ii. 283 : derive not their authority from the subjects of them 39, 314, 315 : ignorance of them does not excuse 40 : obvious meaning of, to be followed 71, 72, 84, 85, 86, 111, 124 : their style should be plain 105 : if ambiguous, a disgrace to the legislator 84, 85, 106, 108—114 : no commanding term can require three different actions 133 : oblige from the authority of the legislator, not merely because they are good 315 : human and divine compared 322

Laws, divine, clearly expressed 82—85, 105 : though ever so plain, difficulties may be raised 26 : nothing necessary but what they make so 36 : virtuous persons desire to understand them 40 : not to be understood in a secondary and far-fetched sense 72—79, 85, 86, 119—125 : distinguish between dipping, pouring, and sprinkling 82—85, 105 : to omit, weakness ; to alter, impudence 301 : provide for every case 316 : not to be dispensed with, or altered 316, 330 : how interpreted by Popish casuists 328

Law of baptism ; pretended by some to be equivocal and obscure— to determine nothing but that water should be applied in some form or other—that plunging, pouring, and sprinkling are equally agreeable to it—that the mode of use is a mere circumstance—that another enacting word would have been used, had immersion only been intended 104 : answered 104—145 : that it is indeterminate, in respect of the subjects, as well as the mode ii. 57 : answered ii. 60—64

Lord's day, why observed ii. 73

Lord's supper, not to be neglected 36—43 : wine of, by some, sucked through a tube 85 : considered by many as a sacrifice 119, 120, 121 : bread should be broken 183 : some Papists wish for the administration of both kinds to be restored 299 : Nichols pronounces a table gesture, a saucy posture 325 : no warrant for mixing the wine with water ii. 63 : evidence of women partaking ii. 73, 74, 75

Luke would have mentioned infant baptism, if practised ii. 23—27

M.

Matt. xxviii. 19. speaks of adults only ii. 270, 273, 277—280 : is divine law, and to be understood in its obvious meaning ii. 282—286 : requires all to be taught ii. 286—289 : either includes all infants, or none ii. 291 : if infants, it warrants the baptizing of all adults ii. 292, 293, 295, 296 : terms, *all nations*, how used ii. 296, 297 : compared with Mark xvi. 15, 16. ii. 300, 301

Matt. xix. 14. neither Christ nor his apostles baptized the little children ii. 336—339 : infants not then baptized, *ibid.* Christ's regard to infants, matter of joy ii. 340

Means, neglect of, shows indifference to the end 42

Mercy, and not sacrifice, 3, 118, 325, 326, 327

Michael's rebuke, applied 265

Miracle of feeding five thousand, remark upon 241, 242

Mistakes, numerous, by not adverting to the difference between the Jewish and the Christian church ii. 35, 36, 220—224, 253, 254, 255, 260—264, 376, 377, 391—397, 412—415



**Mohammedans** boast the antiquity of their ablutions ii. 180  
**Monachism**, high antiquity of ii. 179, 180  
**Monstrous Births**, Pædobaptists puzzled how to act respecting them ii. 490, 491  
**Montelquieu**, respecting the style of laws 105: compares divine and human laws 322  
**Munster** insurgents, account of ii. 476—481: Baptists not their genuine descendants, but rather of the Waldenses ii. 476, 477: Pædobaptists as nearly related to German fanatics, as the Baptists are ii. 479, 480: true reason of those insurrections ii. 478, 479

#### N.

**Naaman** baptized himself seven times 58, 61, 243  
**Naked**, proselytes to Judaism said to be, when baptized ii. 190: injustice of charging the Baptists with baptizing persons in that condition 258—263, 265, 266: whether the ancients so baptized 260, 261, 263  
**Nebuchadnezzar**, how said to be baptized 54  
**Negatives**, also could not be expressed ii. 40: negative arguments valid in articles of worship ii. 55, 56: reasonings of this kind common ii. 30—36, 39, 40, 41, 105—109, 115, 116, 117: superfluous defended by denying their force ii. 39  
**Newton**, strictures on his Apologia ii. 29, 30, 67, 68  
**Noah's flood** called a baptism 144: his ark, what it figured 168  
**Novatian** the first on record that was not plunged in baptismal water 291: how it was used 282, 293

#### O.

**Obligations**, not to be evaded by doubtful reasonings 330: spiritual, must be personal ii. 151  
**Origen**; the Latin versions of his works corrupted ii. 97—101: what cited from his Greek, not pertinent ii. 101, 102  
**Original depravity** represented as taken away by washing the feet ii. 144  
**Oxford** divines, their acknowledgment ii. 10

#### P.

**Pædobaptism** not practised before the latter end of the second century ii. 76—80, 82, 83: not necessary precisely to point out its commencement ii. 437—441: said to have more of truth, than of evidence ii. 540  
**Pædobaptists** cannot produce a text which enjoins pouring or sprinkling 94: nor show to what part of the body water should be applied 95, 96: should abide by obvious meaning of the term baptism 121: do not imitate John, as represented by themselves 245. ii. 3: their account of his practice seems to exclude infants 215: their practice compared with that of Papists, in denying eucharistical wine to the people 225, 226, 229, 230, 246, 279, 280, 296—312: charged, by Quakers, with insincerity ii. 13, 14: high opinion of baptism among the moderns ii. 131—145: treat divine law as Mohammedans do the Koran ii. 308, 309: would not defend their cause from the O. T. if the N. T. afforded proof ii. 319, 320: their extravagant notions relating to carnal descent ii. 321—327: tendency of their weak arguments, as acknowledged by Baxter ii. 335: depart from their own rule, by making privileges of N. T. less than those of the

- the Q. B. ii. 413, 468, 469: distinguished, under the N. T. into clean and unclean ii. 413, 414: their ways of cleansing the impure ii. 414: admit the facts on which Baptists reason ii. 483, 484: explain texts as they do ii. 485, 486: differ exceedingly among themselves, as to whose infants are to be baptized ii. 487—490: as to the proper grounds of infant baptism ii. 491—499: and as to the purposes for which infants are to be baptized ii. 499—504: some of them consider the utility of Pædobaptism as a difficult subject ii. 502, 503: others say things inimical to its existence ii. 503, 511: their inconsistencies compared with those of the Papists ii. 505, 506, 507
- Parents, unwilling to have their children dipped 210, 219, 288: cannot transmit spiritual prerogatives ii. 327: their faith does not entitle their children to baptism ii. 327
- Particles, Greek, remarks upon 79. ii. 597
- Pasover, Christ so called ii. 262: children partook of it ii. 269
- Paul opposes preaching to baptizing ii. 300, in what sense not sent to baptize ii. 301, 302
- Pedercetti, who 135
- Persons cannot be sprinkled or poured into any thing 82
- Petrobrusians denied infant baptism ii. 124
- Perulance of ignorant opponents reproved ii. 509
- Philip baptized no infants among the Samaritans ii. 24, 25
- Plunging; why to be retained 183: pouring, and sprinkling, different actions 231: if either of the latter had been originally used, not likely the first would have been adopted 231: supposed indecency of, lay much stronger against circumcision 320
- Pope; his infallibility opposed ii. 20, 21: much in the N. T. about Antichrist, nothing of Christ's vicar ii. 158
- Popish priests, certain, supposed Luther composed the N. T. 236
- Pouring, not warranted by the word baptism 79: absurd to render the term, in some places 88: or sprinkling, if intended, another word would have been used 145: against an ecclesiastical law of England 168, 227: contrary to the meaning of the ordinance 168: if apostles had used it, they would not have spoken of dying and rising again in baptism 170, 183: reasons of pouring and sprinkling being used 274, 282—296: when they first prevailed in England 287, 289: delicate reason for their use 285: supposed lawful, not necessary 321: used only where the Papal power is, or was formerly acknowledged 290
- Presumptive argument, one for infant baptism, retuted ii. 340—343
- Prohibition, want of, no proof of any thing in worship being lawful ii. 39, 40, 41
- Proselyte baptism: wild notions about its commencement ii. 178—181: not mentioned by ancient fathers ii. 183, 184, 185: rabbies divided about it ii. 167: a civil rite ii. 166: future offspring of proselytes not baptized ii. 165, 166, 172: fetched from the Talmuds ii. 167, 173, 183: Christian baptism not derived from it ii. 163, 170—176: not practised by modern Jews ii. 175: its commencement very uncertain ii. 178, 179: not regarded by Christ in his commission ii. 185—189: can be no rule for us ii. 189—195: extremely different from Christian baptism ii. 190, 191: could not supersede the necessity of an express

express command for infant baptism ii. 195, 196: Dissenting Pædobaptists cannot argue from it, without inconsistency ii. 195, 196: nor any Protestants, without adopting a Popish principle of reasoning ii. 197

Protestants unite in pleading the silence of Scripture against Papists ii. 31, 32, 105; and of the Fathers ii. 105—108, 115, 116, 117: their reasonings applied to Pædobaptism, *ibid.* Consider terms and rites, not mentioned in Scripture, as beginning to be used when first found in ancient writers ii. 108, 109, 112, 113: obliged to plead tradition for infant baptism ii. 436, 437: reproached for so doing by Papists ii. 437

Publicans (Christians so called) denied infant baptism ii. 124, 125

Q.

Quakers agree that baptism is immersion 66—69, 224: despise sprinkling 67, 68, 69: in favour of their opposition to baptism, interpret Rom. vi. 3, 4. in a manner similar to some Pædobaptists 182: consider John as baptizing only such as professed repentance ii. 23: maintain that there is no divine authority for infant baptism ii. 12, 13, 14: that it was not practised till the third century ii. 82, 83: that circumcision affords no evidence for Pædobaptism ii. 249, 250: that Matt. xxviii. 19. xix. 14. Acts xvi. 15, 33. 1 Cor. i. 16. vii. 14. do not support it ii. 282, 339, 360, 361, 380: that infant baptism is a Popish tradition ii. 13, 14

R.

Raiment, whether changed at the administration of baptism 237

Red sea; passage of Israelites through it, a resemblance of baptism 151, 168, 170, 175, 186—189

Repentance and faith, nature of ii. 305, 306

Ritualism, considered by Quakers as neither baptism, nor washing 67, 68: but called baptism to gain it acceptance 69

Rituals, ancient, require immersion 213: prove the practice for thirteen centuries 213: used by Benedict XIII. at the baptism of certain persons 222

Roman Catholics justify a refusal of the cup, from the practice of sprinkling among Protestants 219, 225, 226, 304—307: acknowledge that the Lord's supper was anciently administered in both kinds 225, 226: their festival called, The benediction of horses 239: pretend they preserve the essence of the supper, in their mutilated communion 280: claim authority to alter ceremonies divinely appointed 287, 326: allow that both they and Protestants have altered the mode of baptism 210, 287, 304, 305: ridicule the manner of using baptismal water, practised by some Protestant Pædobaptists 288: allow infant baptism cannot be proved from Scripture ii. 68, 69: refer to the O. T. for proof of their superstitions ii. 317, 318, 418: insist upon the time of their corruptions commencing, being pointed out ii. 422, 423, 425, 426: will not admit the silence of Scripture as cogent against them ii. 39, 40

Russians use the true immersion 267

S.

Sacraments clearly revealed 25: circumstances of them, easily distinguished from their substance 33: have an aptitude to represent

- sent the things signified 33, 34, 179, 180 : what is not command-  
 ed respecting them, is unlawful 35, 322 : corrupted by addi-  
 tions accounted ornamental 330 : instituted for believers only  
 ii. 47—50, 202—206
- Saxony, confession of, represents baptism as dipping 270
- Scripture (see Bible); wrested by some 247 : favours the Baptists  
 60 : rules for its interpretation 70—79 : true sense, one only 71 :  
 some would have the sense to vary according to the times 136,  
 137. ii. 308 : reproached with being uncertain 113 : an unerring  
 rule 322, 323 : the only rule ii. 15—20, 41, 42, 84, 81 : forbids  
 what it does not require ii. 16—19 : and not Providence, our  
 rule ii. 153 : strange applications of ii. 317, 318, 319, 336, 417,  
 418
- Seals; on the principles of Pædobaptism, some persons had 218  
 ii. 257 : baptism not a seal ii. 264—269
- Selah, meaning of, as clear as that of the word baptize, according  
 to some 107
- Ship, said to be unbaptized 59
- Similar practice produces similar language 234
- Sinners, why called fools in Scripture 331
- Slaves, in the West Indies, disciplined by baptism, and remarks up-  
 on it ii. 303, 304
- Socinians; their manner of explaining Scripture 73—77 : some of  
 them confine baptism to converts from Jews, Turks, or Pagans  
 ii. 71, 514, 515 : garble the Scripture ii. 537
- Sons of God, their liberty 39
- Sponsors, use of, as ancient as infant baptism ii. 76, 77, 95, 96, 97 :  
 used first for adults, and now practised by Church of England ii.  
 95, 96 : absurdities of the practice ii. 122, 123
- Sprinkling; not to be called baptism 44, 67, 68, 69 : if it had been  
 appointed, the enacting term would have expressed it 68 : no  
 word of which that is the radical idea, used for the ordinance  
 91 : cannot represent the design of the ordinance 181 : some  
 who practise it lament the disuse of immersion 184, 219, 222,  
 331, 332, 333 : how it came to be used 282—291 : impeaches  
 God's wisdom 303 : retained from the Romish church 331,  
 332 : mere water never sprinkled under the law 298
- Sueveland, confession of, relating to baptism 156
- T.
- Teaching to precede baptism ii. 269—280, 345 : no example in  
 the N. T. of the reverse being practised ii. 272
- Tertullian opposed infant baptism ii. 79, 92, 440 : fond of tradi-  
 tions ii. 94 : approved, in certain cases, of Anabaptism ii. 97
- Temple, numerous offerings at its dedication 250
- Testament, Old, all ritual worship clearly appointed under it 22,  
 ii. 41
- Testament, New, the only rule of evangelical rites 20, 21, 22 : the  
 laws of it as easy to be understood as those of Jewish ceremonies  
 in the Old ii. 41, 42
- Thanks, his celebrated saying ii. 74
- Tithes, a delicious part of the Jewish law ii. 36 : evidence of them,  
 under the N. T. and that for infant baptism, compared ii. 38 :  
 perhaps of paradisaical antiquity ii. 181

**Traditions; the rule of worship to multitudes 28 : various among the Fathers, mentioned ii. 94, 95, 438, 439 : not explanations of Scripture ii. 389 : early, very erroneous ii. 419—422 : prove not infant baptism to be apostolic ii. 421 : Austin's opinion of, ridiculed ii. 420 : no church admits one half of what are so called ii. 428 : preferred to Scripture, by Papists ii. 429 : adopted by Protestants when Scripture fails ii. 429—432 : superfluous and wicked ii. 431 : Jews made void the law by them ii. 431 : pleaded in favour of infant baptism ii. 432, 434 : the reason of it ii. 436, 437 : in proof of infant communion ii. 444**  
**Trent, council of, canons and decrees designedly obscure 109, 113 : maintains plunging, pouring, and sprinkling, to be equally valid 131 : prefers an application of water to the head, as the seat of sensation 135 : benefits of baptism ii. 135**  
**Trine immersion of great antiquity 53, 270, 289 : whence it originated 270 : not known to the Apostles 270 : not meant by the doctrine of baptism 271 : ordered by the Common Prayer of Edward VI. 271 : continued long in England 312**

#### U.

**Unbaptized, soul said to be 99**  
**Unction, ancient, 36**  
**Uzzah punished 316. ii. 55**

#### W.

**Waldenses commended ii. 19, 20 : Baptists descended from them ii. 476**  
**Washing; of the feet, why practised by the ancients 96 : not the native meaning of the term baptism 129, 175 : not the principal idea in the ordinance 175**  
**Water, the manner of using it not a circumstance of baptism 129 : if omitted, baptism is wanting 130 : variously applied in what some call baptism 135**  
**Waters, many, meaning of 210**  
**Wesley, J. baptized a sick child, by immersion, that recovered from the time of administration 196**  
**Will-worshipper described ii. 17, 18**  
**Williams' and Horley's very singular view of the term baptize 103, 104 : refuted 105—145 : former of them claims the same reason for sprinkling infants as the Baptists have for immersing adults ii. 64 : this considered ii. 64—67 : admits the right of infants to the Lord's supper, yet forbids their partaking of it ii. 451, 452 : considered ii. 464—468**  
**Words, their most usual signification to be regarded 73, 124 : consequence of departing from this rule 119—125 : 188 word equally signifies three different actions 131 : the most plain and express may be evaded 145, 146**  
**Worship, religious, if not appointed of God, rejected by him 27, 52, 317, 330. ii. 15—19 : whatever he appoints must be observed 317, 318, 331 : baptism an ordinance of ii. 304—307.**

# E R R A T A.

Vol. I. p. 167. line 4. for *did*, read, and did. P. 192. l. penult.  
*f. right*, r. rite. Vol. II. p. 50. l. 32. *f. II.* r. I. P. 57. l. pe-  
 nult. t. *all*, r. chiefly. P. 229. l. 27. after *thus*, add, 'None  
 ' but the males underwent this ceremony—This was. P. 899.  
 l. 31. after *legality*, add, or illegality. P. 427. l. ult. *f. No. 7.*  
 r. p. 13, 14. P. 439. l. 4. *f. Chriftrians*, r. Christmas. P. 480.  
 l. ult. *f. ad's*, r. aris. P. 521. l. 16. *f. are*, r. were.

*Lately published by the Author,*  
The **THIRD** EDITION, 10mo (Price, bound, Three Shillings  
and Six-Pence) of

**The R E I G N of G R A C E.**

Sold by J. Buckland, Pater Noster Row, and C. Dilly, in the Poultry.

A N D

**The DEATH of LEGAL HOPE, the LIFE  
of EVANGELICAL OBEDIENCE.**

The **SECOND** EDITION, 12mo. Price One Shilling and Six Pence

Sold by J. Buckland, W. Ash, Little Tower Street, and  
W. Button, Newington Causeway.

---

---

## PÆDOBAPTISM EXAMINED

---

### CHAPTER I.

*Concerning the Nature, Obligation, and Implications of Positive Institutions in Religion.*

**D**R. DODDRIDGE: "Those are called positive institutions or precepts, which are not founded upon any reasons known to those to whom they are given, or discoverable by them, but which are observed merely because some superior has commanded them," *Lectures*, Definit. lxxi. p. 238.

2. Bp. TAYLOR: "All institutions sacramental, and positive laws, depend not upon the nature of the things themselves, according to the extension or diminution of which our obedience might be measured; but they depend wholly on the will of the Lawgiver, and the will of the Supreme, being actually limited to this specification, this manner, this matter, this institution: whatsoever comes besides, it hath no foundation in the will of the Legislator, and therefore can have no warrant or authority. That it be obeyed, or not obeyed, is all the question and all the variety. If it can be obeyed, it must; if it cannot, it must be let alone—Whatsoever depends



upon a divine law or institution, whatsoever God wills, whatsoever is appointed instrumental to the signification of a mystery, or to the collation of a grace or a power, he that does any thing of his own head, either must be a despiser of God's will, or must suppose himself the author of a grace, or else to do nothing at all in what he does; because all his obedience and all the blessing of his obedience depends upon the will of God, which ought always to be obeyed when it can; and when it cannot, nothing can supply it, because the reason of it cannot be understood—All positive precepts, that depend upon the mere will of the Lawgiver,—admit no degrees, nor suppletory and commutation: because in such laws we see nothing beyond the words of the law, and the first meaning, and the named instance; and therefore it is that *in individuo* which God points at—it is that in which he will make the trial of our obedience—it is that in which he will so perfectly be obeyed, that he will not be disputed with, or enquired of, *why*, and *how*, but just according to the measures there set down *so, and no more, and no less, and no otherwise*. For when the will of the Lawgiver is *all the reason*, the first instance of the law is *all the measures*, and there can be no product but what is just set down. No parity of reason can infer any thing else; because there is no reason but the will of God, to which nothing can be equal, because his will can be but one.” *Ductor Dub. B. II. Chap. III. § 14, 18.*

3. Mr. RIFLES. “The distinction of obligations between moral and positive duties is to be understood with great caution. For though the goodness of a law be a great motive and inducement to obedience, yet the formal reason of obligation does not arise from the goodness of a law, but from the authority and will of the  
the

the legislator. God commands a thing which was before indifferent; therefore that thing is as much a law as if it was never so good in its own nature: he forbade the eating of a tree in the midst of the garden, which without that prohibition had been indifferent. But Adam, and in him all his posterity, was condemned for the breach of a law purely positive—When God therefore says, that he *will have mercy and not sacrifice*, it is not to be understood as if God would have any of his laws broken; but, as our Saviour explains it, *These ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone*. I ask then, what are *natural laws*? Why, what we conclude merely from the light of nature that God has commanded or forbidden, either to be believed or done. What then are *positive laws*? Why, what we know to be the will of God by his *express word* only. In both cases then we see, that 'tis the will of God, and not the goodness of the thing, or the manner of the discovery, which induces the obligation." *Apologies*, Vol. II. p. 217, 218. Edit. 1709.

4. DR. FIDDES: "The distinction between positive law and moral law, is founded in this difference: The subject matter of positive law is something to which we are antecedently under no obligation, and which only obliges by virtue of its being enacted, and perhaps to a certain limited period. The subject matter of a moral law is, on the other hand, something antecedently, in the visible reason of it, obligatory to us, and the obligation thereof will always continue unchangeably the same—By a positive command, I understand an *express* declaration made by competent authority, whether concerning things to be done, or to be omitted." *Theolog. Pract.* B. I. Chap. vi. p. 50. B. II. Part I. Chap. i. p. 105.

5. DR. OWEN: "Positive institutions—are the free effects of the will of God, depending originally and solely on revelation, and which therefore have been various and actually changed." *Discourse concerning the Holy Spirit*, B. I. Chap. iii. § 3.

6. BUDDÉUS: "The obligation by which men are bound rightly to use positive appointments, is to be derived from the moral law itself; by which it is manifest, that men are obliged to do all those things by which their eternal felicity may be promoted—God had the wisest reasons, why he would have an appointment administered in this or the other manner. It is not lawful, therefore, for men to alter any thing, or to mutilate the appointment. Thus the sacraments are to be used, not according to our own pleasure, but in the manner appointed by God." *Institut. Theol. Moral.* Pars I. C. v. § 18. Pars II. C. ii. § 50. Lipl. 1727.

7. Bp. BUTLER: "Moral precepts, are precepts the reasons of which we see; positive precepts, are precepts the reasons of which we do not see. Moral duties arise out of the nature of the case itself, prior to external command; positive duties do not arise out of the nature of the case, but from external command; nor would they be duties at all, were it not for such command, received from Him whose creatures and subjects we are. But the manner in which the nature of the case, or the fact of the relation, is made known, this doth not denominate any duty either positive or moral—The reason of positive institutions, in general, is very obvious; though we should not see the reason why such particular ones are pitched upon, rather than others. Whoever, therefore, instead of cavilling at words, will attend to the thing itself, may clearly see, that positive institutions in general, as distinguished

guished from this or that particular one, have the nature of moral commands; since the reasons of them appear. Thus, for instance, the external worship of God, is a moral duty, though no particular mode of it be so. Care then is to be taken, when a comparison is made between positive and moral duties, that they be compared no farther than as they are different; no farther than as the former are positive, or arising out of mere external command, the reasons of which we are not acquainted with: and as the latter are moral, or arising out of the apparent reason of the case, without such external command. Unless this caution be observed, we shall run into endless confusion. Now this being premised, suppose two standing precepts enjoined by the same authority; that in certain conjunctures it is impossible to obey them both; that the former is moral, *i. e.* a precept of which we see the reasons, and that they hold in the particular case before us; but the latter is positive, *i. e.* a precept of which we do not see the reasons: it is indisputable that our obligations are to obey the former, because there is an apparent reason\* for this preference, and none against it—As it is one of the peculiar weaknesses of human nature, when, upon a comparison of two things, one is found to be of greater importance than the other, to consider this other as of scarce any importance at all; it is highly necessary that we remind ourselves how great presumption it is, to make light of any institution of divine appointment; that our obligations to obey all God's commands whatever, are absolute and indispensable; and that commands merely positive, admitted to be from Him, lay us under a moral obligation to obey them, an obligation moral in the strictest and most proper sense." *Analogy of Religion*, Part II. Chap. i.

8. Dr. J. G. KING: "Positive duties, having no obligation in the reason of things, can have no foundation but in the *express words* of the institutor, from which alone they derive their authority." *Rites and Ceremonies of the Greek Church in Russia*, p. 12.

9. Mr. JONATHAN EDWARDS: "Those laws whose obligation arises from the nature of things, and from the general state and nature of mankind, as well as from God's positive revealed will, are called *moral laws*. Others, whose obligation depends merely upon God's positive and arbitrary institution, are not moral: such as the ceremonial laws, and the precepts of the Gospel about the two sacraments"—Positive "precepts are the greatest and most proper trial of obedience; because in them the mere authority and will of the legislator, is the sole ground of the obligation, and nothing in the nature of the things themselves; and therefore they are the greatest trial of any person's respect to that authority and will." *Sermons*, p. 232. Hartford, 1780. *Sermons on Imp. Sub.* p. 79. Edinb. 1785.

10. Bp. BURNET: "Sacraments are positive precepts, which are to be measured ONLY by the institution, in which there is not room left for us to carry them any further." *Expofit. xxxix Articles*, Art. xxvii. p. 279. Edit. 5.

11. Mr. STEELE: "Sacraments depend merely upon their institution: hence doth their being result, and upon this their matter and signification do depend. The institution, with the elements, makes the sacrament; and so the *only* rule and balance for them must needs be their institution." *Morning Exercise against Popery*, Sermon. xxii. p. 764, 765.

12. STAP.

## CHAPTER II. *Of Positive Institutions*

12. STAPPERUS : "Visible signs are the matter of sacraments.—Signs are either natural or arbitrary. Sacred ceremonies are of the latter kind. But whatever an arbitrary sign be, it is such by institution." *Institut. Theolog. Polem.* Tom. I. Cap. iii. § 1623, 1624.

13. Dr. GOODMAN : The term *Institution*, "implies a setting up *de novo*, or the appointing that to become a duty, which was not knowable, or at least not known to be so, before it became so appointed. For this word, *Institution*, is that which we use to express a positive command by, in opposition to that which is moral in the strictest sense, and of natural obligation. Now it is very evident, that all things of this nature ought to be appointed *very plainly and expressly*, or else they can carry no obligation with them: for seeing the whole reason of their becoming matter of law or duty, lies in the will of the Legislator, if that be not *plainly* discovered, they cannot be said to be instituted, and so there can be no obligation to observe them; because where *there is no law, there can be no transgression*; and a law is no law, in effect, which is not sufficiently promulged." *Preserv. against Popery*, Title viii. p. 7.

14. Dr. SHERLOCK : "What is matter of institution depends wholly upon the Divine will and pleasure; and though all men will grant, that God and Christ have always great reason for their institution, yet it is not the reason, but the authority, which makes the institution. Though we do not understand the reasons of the institution, if we see the command, we must obey; and though we could fancy a great many reasons why there should be such an institution, if no such institution appears, we are free, and ought not to believe there is such an institution, because we think

there are reasons to be assigned why it should be." *Preserv. against Pop.* Title ix. p. 419.

15. ANONYMOUS. "We deny that there are any accidental parts of instituted worship, for if instituted (*i. e.* commanded by Christ) it cannot be accidental (*i. e.* left to our liberty, as what may or may not be done without sin) If accidental, it may be a part of somewhat else, but of the instituted worship of Christ it cannot be.—Circumstances of worship (as such) undetermined by the Lord, to be appointed by men, we deny.—These circumstances are such as, without which, the worship of God is perfect, or it is not. If the *first*, we need them not, they are vain, fruitless, having without them a perfect worship. If the *second*, the worship God hath commanded, as it comes out of his hands, without human additaments, is imperfect but this is little less than blasphemy.—To assert, it is lawful to conform to any part of instituted worship, without warrant from the Scripture, reflects sadly upon the wisdom and faithfulness of Christ. For, either he was not wise enough to foresee that such a part of worship was, or would be requisite, or had not faithfulness enough to reveal it. though the Scripture compares him to Moses for faithfulness, who revealed the whole will of God, to the making of a pin in the tabernacle.—We had thought that the perfection of Scripture had consisted in this, that the *whole* of that obedience that God requires of us, had therein been *stated* and *enjoined*, for which end we conceive it was at first commanded to be written, and hitherto by the wonderful gracious providence of the Lord continued to us. The accidentals of worship be either *part* of that obedience we owe to God, or they are not. If not, how came they to be such parts of worship, as without them we  
are

## CHAP. II. *Of Positive Institutions.*

are interdicted to perform it? or, indeed, whence is it, that we are tendering them up to God, when all our worship is nothing else but the solemn tender of that obedience that we owe to him? If they are, then there is some part of our obedience that is not prescribed in the Scripture: then is the Scripture imperfect, and that with respect to the main end for which it was given forth, *viz.* To indoctrinate and direct us in the whole of that obedience, that God requires of us." *Jerubbaal*, Chap. ii. p. 154, 155, 156. •

16. CHAMIERUS: "This is a most certain principle, That the sacraments are nothing, except from their institution; and this institution must be divine. Whatever, therefore, was invented by man, does not belong to a sacrament—The use of the sacraments depends upon their institution—Nothing belongs to the institution of the Lord's Supper, that is not *essential* to it—If the whole essence of the sacrament be of Divine institution, certainly, that being violated, the sacrament itself cannot stand." *Punstrat.* Tom. IV. L. V. C. xvi. § 23. L. VII. C. iii. § 1. C. xv. § 7. L. VIII. C. ii. § 3.

17. GERHARDUS: "Seeing that a sacrament depends entirely on the appointment of God, when we do not what God has appointed, it certainly will not be a sacrament." *Loci Theolog.* Tom. IV. De Sacram. § 52. Francof. 1657.

18. DR. CLAGETT: "To conclude, that in matters depending upon the pleasure of God, he hath done that which seemeth best to our reason; is to suppose that in these things we know what is best, no less than God doth; that we have weighed all the conveniences and inconveniences of either side, the advantages and disadvantages of every thing that lies before us; the arguments for, and the objections



against this or that, with the same exactness, wherein they are comprehended in his infinite understanding — When once the institutions of God are revealed and testified to us, we must not only conclude that they are wise and good, because they are his; but we ought also to take notice of those footsteps of divine wisdom and goodness, which are discernible in them: and the more that a wise man considers and understands their ends and usefulness, the more worthy of their Author he will find them to be. But their congruity to our reason is not the *proof* of their divine institution; since there are very many things, which to our finite understandings would appear as useful and as reasonable, but which yet God hath not instituted — Even where the appointments of God are evident, that wisdom and goodness which I can discover in them, is not the proper ground of my assurance that he hath established them; for that is no other than *the evidence of the institution*. Nor can that discovery alone give me the least assurance, that in making such provision he hath not been wanting to our needs; for the reason of that assurance is this, That it is *He*, it is *GOD*, I say, *that hath made such provision for us*. When it once appears what God hath instituted in order to our salvation, and no more; we are to conclude that this is enough in its kind, because it is all that God hath done. But for that other kind of arguing, That God hath been wanting to us in his institutions, if he has not instituted [this or that,] and therefore he *has* instituted it; I leave to those whose conclusions need it; very much desiring them to consider, *what a cause that must be*, which drives them to such bold reasonings as these are." *Preserv. against Pop.* Title vii. p. 93.

19. \*Dr. GROSVENOR: "The diminutive things that have been said by some of the positive appointments in religion, and the extravagant things that have been said by others, are two extremes which true reasoning leads no body into, on either hand. It is as contrary to the nature of things to make *nothing* of them, as to make them *the whole* of religion. To know exactly the regard that is due to them, is to find out the rank and order they are placed in, by Him who has appointed them—I shall lay together what I have to say on this subject, under the following propositions.

"PROPOSITION I. Some things are absolutely necessary to salvation, and in their own nature. We call those things absolutely necessary, without which there can be no salvation at all. Thus, a mind suited to the happiness intended by the word *salvation*, is absolutely necessary; or holiness, *without which no man shall see the Lord*—All the titles in the world to heaven, can never give the pleasure of heaven, without a suitableness to its enjoyments. Fitness, here, is as the eye, to the delights of colours and prospects; the ear to the pleasures of harmony; and as the palate, to those of taste and relish: that is, a capacity of enjoyment. As there must be an animal nature, for animal pleasures; a rational nature, for the rational ones; so there must be the divine and heavenly nature, for those that are divine and heavenly. No man would care to live even with a GOD whom he did not love.

"PROP. II. No merely positive appointments are necessary in this sense; *i. e.* absolutely and in their own nature—If there never had been a sacrament

\* Anonymous, indeed, but supposed to be Dr. BENJ. GROSVENOR.

in the world, I might have been happy without it :  
 • you cannot say so of love to God and likeness to him——

“ PROP. III. A disposition to obey divine orders, wherever they are discerned, either positive or moral, is part of that *holiness*, without which no man shall see the Lord. I may be saved without a sacrament ; but I cannot be saved without a disposition to obey God’s authority wherever I see it. A sacrament is a positive rite, and not to be compared with moral virtue ; but is not a disposition to obey God’s order, moral virtue, and Christian grace ? Or can there be any moral virtue, or Christian grace, without a disposition to obey the authority of Christ, wherever I discern it ? Surely, obedience to God’s command is a moral excellence, though the instances of that obedience may lie in positive rites. The command to Abraham, to sacrifice his son, was a positive order, and a very strange one too ; seemingly opposite to some moral orders given out before : and yet his disposition to obey, when he was sure of a divine warrant in the case, has set him as the head of all the believing world ; as the hero of faith, the father of the faithful, and the friend of God. The command of sprinkling the blood of the passover upon the door-posts of the Israelites, was an external positive rite ; if there had not been a disposition to obey that order, it would have cost some lives ; as it had like to have done to Moses, the neglect of circumcising his child, as good a man as he was in other respects. Was not the forbidden fruit, a positive instance ? an external thing ? Setting aside the divine prohibition, there was nothing immoral in eating of that, any more than of any other tree ; but disobedience is an immorality, let the instance be what it will. -

“ PROP.

“PROP. IV. The sincerity and truth of such a disposition, is best known by its being uniform and universal. Psalm cxix. 6. Col. iv. 3. The Author of our religion has told us, and added his example to his word, *That thus it becomes us to fulfil all righteousness*, and so ordered himself to be baptized—Baptism was a positive rite, an external thing; and yet he calls it *righteousness*. Such righteousness as became Him who was the Holy One of God; became Him who had intrinsically no need of any outward ceremony; whose inward purity was perfectly divine; and if it became Him to fulfil such sort of righteousness, it can hardly become any, who pretend to be his followers, to neglect it—

“PROP. V. As a competent evidence is supposed needful, for any external rite being of divine appointment; so again, a wilful ignorance of that evidence, or not discerning it, through criminal causes, will not excuse from guilt. The criminal causes of not seeing the evidence for such appointments, are, in this case, as in many other cases, non-enquiry, laziness, prejudice, lust, pride, and passion. That an ignorance owing to these causes, cannot be pleaded for a neglect of any of God's appointments, is so much the general sense of all casuists, that I shall only add here, **THAT IT IS AT EVERY MAN'S PERIL, HOW HE COMES NOT TO KNOW THE WILL OF GOD, AS WELL AS NOT TO DO IT**—We must look to it, how we came not to see the appointment, and must answer that to God and our own conscience. It is not enough to say, *Lord, I did not know it was appointed*; when the answer may justly be, *You never enquired into the matter: you never allowed yourself to think of it: Or if you did, you resolved in your mind, that you would not be convinced. You made the most of every cavi-*

omit, but never minded the solution to any of your objections.

“PROP. VI. The duty and necessity of any external rites, and particularly of sacraments, have their measures and degrees. And here I apprehend, the measures of the duty and necessity of sacraments to be—The authority enjoining. When we see the broad seal of heaven, where there is the divine warrant, *Thus saith the Lord*; it is worse than trifling, to cavil and say, *It is but an external rite*—The degree of evidence, of their being so appointed. Where the evidence is not so clear, the obligation is weakened in proportion; but where the terms are plainly binding, and strongly commanding, there the obligation is not to be evaded—When positive appointments and moral duties cannot be both performed; when the one or the other must be omitted; the preference is given to the moral and spiritual duty—The stress God lays upon them for the time they are to continue. Sprinkling the blood of the passover upon the posts of the doors, was not at all necessary in itself to preservation from the destroying angel; but God laid that stress upon it. The oracle, or the mercy seat, was a mere positive appointment. God could have met Moses any where else; but God laying that stress upon it, measures the degree of the necessity of observing that order; *There will I meet thee, and commune with thee*, Exod. xxv. 22. Moses might have reasoned with himself; *God is every where, and can meet me any where, if he pleases, and if he does not please, he won't do it here*: and so have missed the honour of communion with his Maker; broke the divine order; lost the benefit of the oracle; and offended God, by the neglect—The reason and end of them. If there should be any reasons of these injunctions that we do not know, it is sufficient that they

## CHAP. III. *Of Positive Institutions.* 15

they are known to God. Our obedience is always a *reasonable service*, whether we know God's reasons for the injunction, or no. His command is always reason enough for us—

“PROP. VII. He that commands the outward positive rite, commands the inward and moral temper at the same time. He does not say, *Do this*,—without concerning himself *how* it is done; whether in a manner suitable to an end appointed, or not—There is no such command of his, as enjoins the outward act, without the inward temper and disposition.

“PROP. VIII. Positive appointments for such uses and ends as these, are of a quite different nature from arbitrary impositions; with which they are too often confounded. The idea of *arbitrary*, I think, implies a weakness incompatible to the divine nature; whose perfection it is, to do nothing but for some wise reason, and for some good end—

“PROP. IX. Though no positive appointments are absolutely necessary, yet the contempt of them, and of the divine authority discerned in them, cannot consist with holiness. This contempt may be shown—by, contemptuous language—a careless attendance—a total neglect—and by prostituting them to persons that do condemn them, and to purposes that are unworthy—

“To conclude: External rites are nothing without the inward temper and virtue of mind; the inward temper is but pretended to, in many cases, without the external rites, and is acquired, promoted, and evidenced by the use of them. *If I give all my goods to the poor, and have not charity*; there's the external act, without the inward moral temper, and so it is all *nothing*. If, on the other hand, I say, I have the inward temper of charity, and give nothing to the poor,

poor, but say to my brother; *Be thou warmed—Be thou clothed*—how dwelleth the love of God in that man? Therefore, what God hath joined together, let no man put asunder. Whatever comparative excellence there may be in the two different instances of obedience, they are both instances of obedience; and the direction of our regard is summed up in that text, Matt. xxiii. 23. *These ought ye to have done, and not to have left the other undone.* Moral Obligation to the Positive Appointments in Religion, passim. Lond. 1732.

20. Bp. HOADLY: "I. The partaking of the Lord's supper is not a duty of itself; or a duty apparent to us from the nature of things; but a duty made such to Christians, by the positive institution of Jesus Christ.

"II. All positive duties, or duties made such by institution alone, depend entirely upon the will and declaration of the person who institutes or ordains them, with respect to the real design and end of them: and consequently to the due manner of performing them. For, there being no other foundation for them with regard to us, but the will of the institutors; this will must of necessity be our sole direction, both as to our understanding their true intent, and practising them accordingly: because we can have no other direction in this sort of duties, unless we will have recourse to mere invention; which makes them *our own* institutions, and not the institutions of those who first appointed them.

"III. It is plain, therefore, that the nature, the design, and the due manner of partaking of the Lord's supper, must of necessity depend upon what Jesus Christ, who instituted it, hath declared about it.

"IV.

“ IV. It cannot be doubted, that he himself sufficiently declared to his first and immediate followers the whole of what he designed should be understood by it, or implied in it. • For this being a positive institution depending entirely upon his will ; and not designed to contain any thing in it, but what he himself should please to affix to it; it must follow that he declared his mind about it, *fully* and *plainly* : because otherwise, he must be supposed to institute a duty; of which no one could have any notion without his institution; and at the same time not to instruct his followers sufficiently what that duty was to be.

“ V. It is of small importance, therefore, to Christians to know what the many writers upon this subject, since the time of the Evangelists and Apostles, have affirmed. Much less can it be the duty of Christians to be guided by what any persons, by their own authority, or from their own imaginations, may teach concerning this duty. The reason is plain : because in the matter of an instituted duty (or a duty made so by the positive will of any person) no one can be a judge, but the institutor himself, of what he designed should be contained in it ; and because, supposing him not to have spoken his mind plainly about it, it is impossible that any other person (to whom the institutor himself never revealed his design) should make up that defect. All that is added, therefore, to Christ’s institution, as a necessary part of it, ought to be esteemed only as the invention of those who add it : and the more there is added (let it be done with never so much solemnity, and never so great pretences to authority) the less there is remaining of the simplicity of the institution, as Christ himself left it—

“ VI. The passages in the New Testament, which relate to this duty, and they *alone*, are the original accounts



28
[Quar. D  
 Concerning the Nature  
 counts of the nature and end of this institution; and  
 the only authentic declarations, upon which we of  
 later ages can safely depend." *Works*, Vol. III.  
 p. 845, 846, 847.—See also HRIDEGG, *Corp. Theol.*  
 Loc. IV. § 40. Loc. XXV. § 2. Mr. ALBOP's *Ant sozzo*,  
 p. 468. Dr. RIDGLEY's *Bod. Div. Quest.* XC1, XCII.  
 p. 491, 492 Glasg Edit PUFFENDORF's *Law of*  
*Nat. and Nations*, B. I Chap. VI. § 18. Mr. REY-  
 NOLDS on *Angelical Worlds*, p. 11, 12, 15.

o

## R E F L E C T I O N S.

REFLECT. I. By this learned and respectable  
 body of Pædobaptists we are taught, That positive in-  
 stitutions originate entirely in the sovereign will of  
 God No 1—20—That positive laws must be plain  
 and express No 4, 8, 10, 13, 20—That the obliga-  
 tion to observe them arises, not from the goodness of  
 the things themselves, but from the authority of God.  
 No. 2, 3—That they are determined by divine insti-  
 tution, as to their matter, manner, and signification.  
 No 2, 16, 20—That they admit of no commutation,  
 mutilation or alteration, by human authority. No 2,  
 6—That they depend entirely on divine institution,  
 and are to be regulated by it No 10, 11, 16—That  
 we ought not to conclude God has appointed such a  
 rite, for such a purpose, but if we imagine ourselves  
 to stand in need of it, and that there are sufficient rea-  
 sons for it No 13, 16—That our obligation to observe  
 them does not result from our seeing the reasons of  
 them, but from the command of God, and that his  
 positive command is enforced by the moral law No 6,  
 7, 14—That there are no accidental parts of a posi-  
 tive institution No 15—That it is unlawful to con-  
 form to any part of a religious rite, without a divine  
warrant.

warrant. No. 15.—That it is at our peril to continue ignorant of the will of God, relating to his positive appointments. No. 19.—That it is great presumption to make light of them. No. 7, 19.—That a disposition to obey God in his positive institutes, is part of that holiness without which none shall see the Lord. No. 19.—And, that external rites are of little worth, detached from virtuous tempers. No. 19. Such are the declared sentiments of these respectable Authors, concerning Positive Institutions.

REFLECT. II. As it seems to be the unanimous and well attested opinion of these learned Pædobaptists, that positive institutions derive their whole being from the sovereign pleasure of God; so his revealed will must have given them their existence under every dispensation of true religion. Consequently, we cannot know any thing about their precise nature, their true design, the proper subjects of them, or the right mode of their administration, further than the Scriptures teach: for ‘they are to be measured *only* by the institution, in which there is not room left for us to ‘carry them any further.’ See No. 10, 20. It follows, therefore, from the nature of the case, that positive ordinances must be entirely under the direction of positive precepts, or of examples in Scripture, that are warranted by the Holy Spirit. For, as Dr. GOWIN observes, ‘There is this difference between doctrinal truths and institutions, that one truth may be, ‘by reason, better fetched out of another, and more ‘safely and easily, than institutions. For one truth ‘begets another, and truth is infinite in the consequences of it; but so institutions are not. And the ‘reason of the difference is this; because they depend ‘upon a promise, and upon the power and will of ‘God, immediately to concur with them, and set them ‘up.

up. They are things that are singled out by the will of God, to a spiritual end, with a spiritual efficacy. We may be assured what is an institution of God, by examples which we meet with in the Scriptures: for one way by which Christ was pleased to convey his institutions to us, is by way of examples in the New Testament; without the which, being intended as a rule for us, we acknowledge that a complete rule for all things could not be made forth.—If an example be written as a rule, then it will bind, because there is no supposition of error\*.

Remarkably strong to our purpose, is the language of Dr. SHERLOCK, who speaks as follows: ‘I would not be thought wholly to reject a plain and evident consequence from Scripture; but yet I will *never* admit of a mere consequence to prove an institution, which must be delivered in *plain* terms, as all laws ought to be: and when I have no other proof, but some Scripture-consequences, I shall not think it equivalent to a Scripture-proof. If the consequence be plain and obvious, and such as every man sees, I shall not question it: but remote, and dubious, and disputed consequences, if we have no better evidence, to be sure are a very ill foundation for articles of faith, [or ordinances of worship.] Let our Protestant then tell such disputants, that for the institution of sacraments, and for articles of faith, he expects *plain positive proofs*: that, as much as the Protestant faith is charged with uncertainty, we desire a little more certainty for our faith, than mere inferences from Scripture, and those none of the plainest neither†.—With Dr. SHERLOCK, PETER

\* Works, Vol. IV. *Government of the Church of Christ*, Chap. iv. p. 21, 22.

† *Presbyter. against Pop.* Vol. II. Appendix, p. 23.

MARTYR agrees, when he says, 'It is necessary that we should have a *clear* testimony from the holy Scriptures, concerning sacraments\*.'

It seems, indeed, to be the general practice of all Protestants, when contending with Roman Catholics about their claims of prerogative and their numerous rites, to proceed on this principle: Nothing short of an *explicit* grant, a *positive* command, or a *plain* example in the New Testament, can prove their divine origin. Is the debate concerning Papal *supremacy*, or *infallibility*? No reasonings from remote principles, or conclusions from far-fetched consequences, are allowed. The honour of a dispute being such as depends on the sovereign pleasure and special donation of God, an *explicit* divine grant of these prerogatives is to be demanded.—Are five of their seven sacraments the ceremonies performed by them, when administering the *passion*? Look to supper; their withholding the cup from the people, and other things of this kind, the subjects in debate? Protestants hardly ever fail to require a *direct* proof—a *positive* precept, or a *plain* example, from the New Testament. All arguments drawn from ancient Jewish rites; all that are formed on general principles, or moral considerations; and all endeavours to produce inferential proof; are justly discarded as incompetent—as having nothing to do with the subject. For the subject being no other than the *ritual* part of that worship which God requires under the New Testament; a divine institution of the rites in question, a plain positive order, or an apostolic example, may well be required, before they have a place in our creed, or become a part of our solemn service. If, therefore, the New Testament

\* Apud CHAMIERUM, *Panstrat.* Tom. IV. L. I. C. xi. § 8.

say nothing about the institution or the practice of such rites ; we have nothing to do with them, nor any thing to believe concerning them.—On the same principle Protestant Dissenters proceed, when defending Nonconformity ; using many of the same arguments against their Episcopalian opponents, which those Episcopalians employ, when vindicating their own Secession from the church of Rome. The demand of Nonconformists upon their Episcopalian Brethren is ; *Produce your warrant* (for this, that, and the other) *from our only rule of faith and practice—a divine precept, or an apostolic example, relating to the point in dispute.* So important is this principle, respecting every thing of a positive nature in Christianity, that I can hardly imagine any sensible Protestant would ever think of writing against the Popish system ; or any conscientious Dissenter, of justifying his Nonconformity ; without availing himself of it in many cases. Nay, so obvious and so important is this principle, so congenial to that grand maxim, **THE BIBLE ONLY IS THE RELIGION OF PROTESTANTS** ; that we might well wonder if a judicious author omitted it, when handling the doctrine of Positive Rites ; except it appeared, that he laboured to establish some hypothesis, to which this principle is inimical.

Nor does it appear from the records of the Old Testament, that when Jehovah appointed any branch of ritual worship, he left either the subjects of it, or the mode of administration, to be inferred by the people, from the *relation* in which they stood to himself, or from general *moral* precepts, or from any branch of his *moral* worship ; nor yet from any other well known *positive* rite : but he gave them special directions relating to the very case ; and those directions they were

were bound to regard, whether they appeared in a pleasing or a painful, in a decent or a disgusting light. For as nothing but the Divine will can oblige the conscience, and as that will cannot be known, unless revealed, so, when made known, whether in reference to moral or positive duties, it must oblige. We are bound, therefore, to regard the Divine laws, not so much on account of what they are in themselves, however excellent; as because they are *the will of HIM* whose claim of obedience is prior to every other consideration. See No. 2, 3. Consequently, seeing baptism is as really and entirely a positive institution, as any that were given to the chosen tribes; we cannot with safety infer, either the mode, or the subject of it, from any thing short of a *precept*, or a *precedent*, recorded in Scripture, and relating to that very ordinance.

That the laws of positive worship under the Old Testament were particular, clear, and decisive, will not be denied; and that our Lord has furnished the Gospel Church with as complete a rubric of solemn service in the New Testament, as that recorded by Moses in the Pentateuch, our Pædobaptist Brethren assert. Thus Dr OWEN, for instance: 'All things concerning the worship of God in the whole church or house now under the Gospel, are no less perfectly and completely ordered and ordained by the Lord Jesus Christ, than they were by Moses under the law.\*' Dr ISAAC CHANDLER: 'Christ hath been more faithful than Moses, and therefore hath not left his churches without sufficient rules to walk by†.' Dr. RIDGLEY: 'It is a great disho-

\* On Heb 11 2, 3 Vol II p 26    † *Præface* to Dr OWEN'S  
True Nature of a Gospel Church.

‘ honour to Christ, the king and head of his church, to  
 ‘ suppose that he has left it without a rule to direct  
 ‘ them, in what respects the communion of saints, as  
 ‘ much as it would be to assert that he has left it with-  
 ‘ out a rule of faith. If God was so particular in  
 ‘ giving directions concerning every part of that wor-  
 ‘ ship that was to be performed in the church before  
 ‘ Christ’s coming, so that they were not, on pain of  
 ‘ his highest displeasure, to deviate from it; certainly  
 ‘ we must not think that our Saviour has neglected to  
 ‘ give those laws by which the Gospel Church is to be  
 ‘ governed\* Mr POIRIEIL ‘ Christ was as faithful  
 ‘ in the house of God as Moses, his provision was as  
 ‘ perfect for rituals, as that of Moses was†’

REFLECT. III. It seems natural hence to infer,  
 that our sovereign Lord must have revealed his will  
 concerning the ordinance of *Baptism*, in a manner  
 proportional to its obligation and importance. For,  
 as an appointment of Christ, it originated in his will,  
 and from a revelation of that will the whole of its ob-  
 ligation results. In proportion, therefore, as we an-  
 nex the idea of obscurity to what he says about the  
 mode and the subject of it, we either sink the idea  
 of obligation, to regard it, or impeach the wisdom,  
 the goodness, or the equity of our divine Legisla-  
 tor for we neither have, nor can have any acquaint-  
 ance with a positive institution, further than it is  
 revealed, and a *natural* incapacity will always excuse  
 the non performance of what would otherwise be an  
 indispensable duty. We are therefore obliged to  
 conclude, that our Lord has *clearly* revealed his plea-  
 sure, with reference to both his positive appointments,  
 in that code of law and rule of religious worship,

which are contained in the New Testament. See No. 20.

On this point let us hear Mr. PAYNE, when contending with the learned and artful BOSSUET, bishop of Meaux. 'Surely,' says the Protestant Pædobaptist, 'so wise a lawgiver as our blessed Saviour, would not give a law to all Christians that was not *easy* to be understood by them, it cannot be said without great reflection upon his infinite wisdom, that his laws are so obscure and dark, as they are delivered by himself, and as they are necessary to be observed by us, that we cannot know the meaning of them without a further explication—God's laws may be very fairly explained away, if they are left wholly to the mercy of men to explain them\*.' Agreeable to this is the language of Mr ARCH. HAIL, when he says, 'The appointments of the Deity concerning his worship, are not to be gathered from the uncertain tradition of the elders, the authority of men, or the dictates of our own reason no, they stand engrossed in the volume of his Book, which is the only rule to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy him†' J. A. LURRETTINUS tells us, 'That whatever of importance the Scripture delivers concerning the sacraments, may be included in a few pages, nay, perhaps, in a few lines, and that so as a little child may understand it‡' Once more: CHIMINITUS assures us, that a positive law 'should have an express divine command—Whatever is maintained to be necessary in the church of Christ, should have a command in the divine word, and scriptural examples§.' Nay, even BILLARME

\* *Preface against Pope* TULCAN p 117 + *Constitutional Worship*, Vol I p 30 † *Co, it t J D* See t t l o m I p 18 19. § *Exposition* Co l l l c t p 204, 280





\* itself in command. If this authority be not  
 \* the authority of God, the worship performed in  
 \* obedience unto it, is not the worship of God, but  
 \* of him or them whose commands and authority are  
 \* the reason and cause of it. It is the authority of  
 \* God alone that can make any worship to be reli-  
 \* gious, or the performance of it to be an act of obe-  
 \* dience unto him. God would never allow that the  
 \* will and wisdom of any of his creatures should be the  
 \* rise, rule, or measure of his worship, or any part of  
 \* it, or any thing that belongs unto it. This honour  
 \* he hath reserved unto himself, neither will he part  
 \* with it unto any other. He alone knows what be-  
 \* comes his own greatness and holiness, and what  
 \* tends to the advancement of his glory. Hence the  
 \* Scripture abounds with severe interdictions and  
 \* comminations against them who shall presume to do,  
 \* or appoint, any thing in his worship, besides or be-  
 \* yond his own institution—Divine institution alone,  
 \* is that which renders any thing acceptable unto  
 \* God—All divine service, or worship, must be re-  
 \* solved into divine ordination or institution. A wor-  
 \* ship not ordained of God, is not accepted of God—  
 \* It is an hard and rare thing to have the minds of  
 \* men kept upright with God in the observation of the  
 \* institutions of divine worship. Adam lost himself  
 \* and us all by his failure therein. The Old [Testa-  
 \* ment] Church seldom attained unto it—And at this  
 \* day there are very few in the world who judge a  
 \* diligent observation of divine institutions to be a  
 \* thing of any great importance. By some they are  
 \* neglected, by some corrupted with additions of their  
 \* own, and by some they are exalted above their pro-  
 \* per place and use, and turned into an occasion of  
 \* neglecting more important duties—Our utmost

~~CONCERNING THE WORSHIP OF GOD~~      [CHAP. I.]

care and diligence in the consideration of the mind of God, is required in all that we do about his worship. There is nothing wherein men, for the most part, are more careless. Some suppose it belongs unto their own wisdom to order things in the worship of God, as it seems most meet unto them—Some think they are no farther concerned in these things, than only to follow the traditions of their fathers. This, unto the community of Christians, is the only rule of divine worship. To suppose that it is their duty to enquire into the way and manner of the worship of God, the grounds and reasons of what they practise therein, is most remote from them —It were no hard thing to demonstrate, that the principal way and means whereby God expects that we should give glory unto him in this world, is by a due observation of the divine worship that he hath appointed. For herein do we in an especial manner, ascribe unto him the glory of his sovereignty, of his wisdom, of his grace and holiness: when in his worship we bow down to his authority alone; when we see such an impress of divine wisdom on all his institutions, as to judge all other ways folly in comparison of them; when we have experience of the grace represented and exhibited in them, then do we glorify God aright. And without these things, whatever we pretend, we honour him not in the solemnities of our worship\*.—TURRITTINUS: The appointment of God, is the highest law, the supreme necessity†.—Mr. ARCHIBALD HALL: As we live under the Gospel Dispensation, all our worship must be regulated by Gospel Institution; that it may be performed according to the appoint-

\* On Heb. i. 6. & ix. 1 & viii. 5.      † Institut Theol Loc  
 Quæst. lvi. Tom. III p. 141.

ment of Christ, as King of the church. The same Author, when speaking of baptism, says: 'This ordinance should be observed with an honest simplicity, and kept pure and entire, as Christ hath appointed it. The rule given us in the word of God is our directory, and we do well to take heed to it in this duty, as much as in every other. How grand and awful is that weighty preface to the institution of Christian baptism! Matt. xxviii. 18, 19. Who is the daring, insolent worm, that will presume to dispute the authority, or change the ordinances, of him who is given to be Head over all things to the church?—The solemnity of this ordinance is complete, and all the great purposes of its institution are secured, by the authority and blessing of Christ, who is a rock, whose work is perfect, and all his commandments are sure. His laws are not subject to any of those imperfections, which are attendants of the best contrived systems among men, and frequently need explanations, amendments, and corrections. It is most dangerous and presumptuous, to add any ceremony, or to join any service, on any pretence, unto Heaven's appointment. This is the most criminal rashness; and, if it is not disputing the authority of Christ directly, it is mingling the authority of men with the authority of Him who has a name above every name—When divine authority is interposed to point out the will of God concerning any service, which is enjoined for standing use among the saints,—such a service ought to be observed without any regard to the manners and usages of mankind; because both the substance and the manner of it are the institution of Christ\*.'

\* *Gospel Worship*, Vol. I. p. 32, 325, 326. Vol. II. p. 434.

REFLECT. V. Concerning the *circumstances* of positive institutions, our Pædobaptist Brethren speak as follows. Mr. VINCENT ALSOP: 'Under the  
' Mosaical law God commanded that they should offer  
' to him the—daily burnt-offering; and, in this case,  
' the *colour* of the beast (provided it was otherwise  
' rightly qualified) was a mere *circumstance*: such as  
' God laid no stress upon, and that man had proved  
' himself an arditious, superstitious busy-body, that  
' should curiously adhere to any one colour. But,  
' for the heifer whose ashes were to make the *water of*  
' *separation*, there the colour was no circumstance;  
' but made by God's command a *substantial* part of  
' the service. To be *red*, was as much as to be a  
' *heifer*: for when circumstances have once passed the  
' Royal assent, and are stamp'd with a Divine seal, they  
' become substantials in instituted worship—We  
' ought not to judge that God has little regard to any  
' of his commands, because the matter of them, ab-  
' stracted from his authority, is little: for we must not  
' conceive that Christ sets little by baptism, because  
' the element is plain, fair water; or little by that  
' other sacrament, because the materials thereof are  
' common bread and wine—For though the things  
' in themselves be small, yet his authority is great—  
' Though the things be small, yet God can bless them  
' to great purposes, 2 Kings, v. 11.—Nor are we to  
' judge that God lays little stress upon his institutes,  
' because he does not immediately avenge the con-  
' tempt and neglect of them upon the violators. Ec-  
' cles. viii. 11. Matt. v. 29. 1 Cor. xi. 30.—As we  
' must not think that God appreciates whatever men  
' set a high value upon, so neither are we to judge  
' that he disesteems any thing because it is grown out  
' of fashion, and thereby exposed to contempt by the  
' atheistical

' atheistical wits of mercenary writers.—If any of  
 ' Christ's institutions seem necessary to be broken,  
 ' it will be first necessary to decry them as poor, low,  
 ' inconsiderable circumstances; and then to fill the  
 ' people's heads with a noise and din, that Christ lays  
 ' little stress on them; and in order hereto call them  
 ' the *circumstantials*, the *accidentals*, the *minutes*, the  
 ' *punctilioes*, and, if need be, the petty Johns of reli-  
 ' gion, that conscience may not kick at the contemn-  
 ' ing of them.—It would be injurious to conclude  
 ' that God has very little respect to his own institu-  
 ' tions, because he may suspend their exercise *pro hic*,  
 ' & *nunc*, rather than the duties impetrated by a moral  
 ' precept. *Mint, anise, and cummin* are inconsider-  
 ' able things, compared with the *weightier matters of*  
 ' *the law, judgment, mercy, and faith*; and yet our Sa-  
 ' viour tells them, Matt. xxiii. 23. *These ought ye to*  
 ' *have done, and not to have left the other undone*—  
 ' God is the sovereign and absolute legislator, who  
 ' may suspend, rescind, alter his own laws at pleasure;  
 ' and yet he has laid such a stress upon the meanest of  
 ' them, that no man may, nor any man, but *the man*  
 ' *of sin*, dares presume to dispense with them, much  
 ' less to dispense against them—*Positives* may be al-  
 ' tered, changed, or abolished, by the Legislator, when,  
 ' and how far he pleases; but this will never prove  
 ' that he lays little stress upon them whilst they are  
 ' not changed, not abolished: nor will it prove that  
 ' man may chop and change, barter and truck one of  
 ' God's least circumstantials, because the Lawgiver  
 ' himself may do it. He that may alter one, may, for  
 ' aught I know, alter them all, seeing they all bear the  
 ' same image and superscription of divine authority  
 ' —If God was so rigorous in his animadversions,  
 ' so punctual in his prescriptions, when his institu-

tions were so numerous, his prescriptions so multi-  
 form; what will he be when he has prescribed us so  
 few, and those so easy and useful to the observer?  
 If we cannot be punctual in the observation of a  
 very few positives of so plain signification, how  
 should we have repined had we been charged with  
 a numerous retinue of types and carnal rudiments!  
 If Christ's yoke be accounted heavy, how should we  
 have sunk under the Mosaical pædagog<sup>y</sup>\*!

Mr. PAYNE: It is from the institution of the  
 sacrament [of the Lord's supper,] that we know  
 what belongs to the substance of it, and is essential  
 to it, and what is only circumstantial and accidental.  
 I own, there were several things, even at the insti-  
 tution of it by Christ, which were only circumstan-  
 tials; as, the place, the time when, the number of  
 persons to whom, the posture in which he gave it;  
 for all these are plainly, and in their own nature,  
 circumstantial matters; so that nobody can think it  
 necessary or essential to the sacrament, that it be ce-  
 lebrated in an upper room, at night after supper,  
 only with twelve persons, and those sitting or lying  
 upon beds, as the Jews used to do at meals: for the  
 same thing which Christ bids them do, may be done,  
 the same sacramental action performed in another  
 place, at another time, with fewer or more persons,  
 and those otherwise postured or situated; but it can-  
 not be the same sacrament or same action, if bread  
 be not blessed and eaten, if wine be not blessed and  
 drunken, as they were both then blessed by Christ,  
 and eaten and drunk by his Apostles. The doing  
 of these is not a *circumstance*, but the *very thing it-*  
*self*, and the very substance and essence of the sacra-

\* *Solber Inquiry*, p. 289---304.

ment ; for without these we do not what Christ did ;  
 whereas we may do the very same thing which he  
 did, without any of those circumstances with which  
 he did it—The command of Christ, *Do this*, does  
 not in the least extend to these [circumstances,] but  
 only to the sacramental action of  *blessing bread and  
 eating it ; blessing wine and drinking it, in remem-  
 brance of Christ*. For that was the thing which Christ  
 did, and which he commanded them to do—He  
 that does not plainly see those to be circumstances  
 [before mentioned,] and cannot easily distinguish  
 them from the thing itself which Christ did, and  
 commanded to be done, must not know what it is  
 to eat and drink, unless it be with his own family,  
 in such a room of his own house, and at such an  
 hour of the day : it is certainly as easy to know  
 what Christ instituted, and what he commanded, as  
 to know this ; and, consequently, what belongs to  
 the essence of the sacrament, without which it would  
 not be such a sacrament as Christ celebrated and ap-  
 pointed, as to know what it is to eat and to drink ;  
 and yet Monsieur DE MEAUX is pleased to make  
 this the great difficulty, *To know what belongs to the  
 essence of the sacrament, and what does not, and to  
 distinguish what is essential in it, from what is not*.\*

—Mr. ARCH. HALL : ‘ The signs, and even every  
 circumstance relative to the use of them, must be ap-  
 pointed by Christ, and not contrived by men : for  
 here, as in every other duty, we must observe all  
 things that Christ hath commanded us. It is equally  
 presumptuous and vain, to teach for doctrines the  
 commandments or inventions of men. The signs  
 that are used in the sacraments have a natural

\* *Preserv. against Pop.* Title vii. p. 110, 137, 138.



‘themselves to bring the things they represent to our mind\*.’

REFLECT. VI. With regard to positive institutions Protestant Pædobaptists further inform us, That the Lord Jesus Christ is *jealous* of his honour; that what is not commanded, need not be *forbidden*; and that nothing is *lawful*, which is not a duty. The following instances may here suffice. DR. WITHER-  
 SPOON: Our obedience ‘must be implicit; founded ‘immediately on the authority of God. We must not ‘take upon us to judge of the moment and import-  
 ‘ance of any part of his will, further than he hath ‘made it known himself. It is a very dangerous thing ‘for us to make comparisons between one duty and  
 ‘another; especially with a view of dispensing with ‘any of them, or altering their order, and substituting ‘one in another’s place†.’—DR. OWEN: ‘Christ  
 ‘marrying his church to himself, taking it to that re-  
 ‘lation, still expresseth the main of their chaste and  
 ‘choice affections to him, to lie in their keeping his  
 ‘institutions and his worship according to his appoint-  
 ‘ment. The breach of this he calls *adultery* every-  
 ‘where, and *whoredom*: he is a *jealous* God, and he  
 ‘gives himself that title only in respect of his institu-  
 ‘tions. And the whole apostacy of the Christian  
 ‘church unto false worship, is called fornication,  
 ‘Rev. xvii. 5. and the church that leads the others to  
 ‘false worship, *the mother of harlots*. On this ac-  
 ‘count, those believers who really attend to cōmmu-  
 ‘nion with Jesus Christ, do labour to keep their hearts  
 ‘chaste to him in his ordinances, institutions, and  
 ‘worship—They will receive nothing, practise no-  
 ‘thing, own nothing in his worship, but what is of

\* *Gospel Worship*, Vol. I. Chap. vii. p. 235.  
*courses*, Vol. I. p. 335.

† *Practical Dis-*

his

his appointment. They know that from the foundation of the world he never did allow, nor ever will, that in any thing the will of the creatures should be the measure of his honour, or the principle of his worship, either as to matter or manner—That principle, *That the church hath power to institute and appoint any thing, or ceremony belonging to the worship of God*, either as to matter or to manner, beyond the orderly observance of such circumstances as necessarily attend such ordinances as Christ himself hath instituted, lies at the bottom of all the horrible superstition and idolatry, of all the confusion, blood, persecution and wars, that have for so long a season spread themselves over the face of the Christian world; and it is the design of a great part of the Revelation [of John] to make a discovery of this truth\*.—Mr. ARCH. HAIL: ‘God will bless nothing but his own institutions. The inventions of men, in serving God, are as unprofitable, as they are wicked and presumptuous, Deut. xii. 31, 32.—We cannot think God will honour the inventions of men, however they may be dignified with the specious names of useful, decent, agreeable, or prudent contrivances; yet if they are an addition to his system, will he not say, *Who hath required these things at your hands?*’—HOORNBEKUS: ‘In what relates to the sacraments and the affairs of religion, it is unlawful to do any thing that is not warranted by the command of God†.’—Dr. SHERLOCK: ‘Our [Popish] author, and some of his size, who don’t see half a consequence before them, think they have a mighty advantage of us, in demanding

\* *Commun. with God*, Part II. Chap. v. p. 169, 170. + *View of Gospel Church*, p. 33, 82. † *Socin. Confut.* Tom. III. p. 436.

the same proofs from us to justify our rejecting their doctrines, which we demand of them to justify their belief of them. That is to say, as we demand of them a scripture-proof, that there is such a place as purgatory; they think they may as reasonably demand of us a scripture-proof, that there is *no* such place as purgatory: just with as much reason, as if one should tell me, that by the laws of England every man is bound to marry at twenty years old; and when I desire him to show me the law which makes this necessary, he should answer, Though he cannot show such a law, yet it may be necessary, unless I can show him a law which expressly declares that it is not necessary. Whereas nothing is necessary, but what the *law* makes so; and if the law has not made it necessary, there is no need of any law to declare, that it is not necessary\*.'—Dr. OWEN: 'What men have a *right* to do in the church, by God's institution, that they have a *command* to do†.'—ANONYMOUS: 'There is nothing relating to instituted worship, as such,—that is lawful, but is our necessary duty; viz. necessary, *necessitate præcepti* instituting it‡.'

REFLECT. VII. That the subjects of positive divine laws cannot *sight* or *neglect* them without offending God, is maintained with a decisive tone by our learned Pædobaptist Brethren. Thus, for instance, Bp. TAYLOR: 'The positive laws of Jesus Christ cannot be dispensed with by any human power—All laws given by Christ, are now made for ever to be obligatory§.'—Mr. JOSEPH WHITE, speaking of the ancient ceremonial law, says: 'To slight any

\* *Preservat. against* &c. Vol. II Appendix, p. 65. † On *Heb.* iii. 4, 5, 6 Vol. III. p. 127. ‡ *Jerubbaal*, p. 458. § *Dudley* Dub. B. II. Chap. iii. p. 334.

‘ of its services, was to insult the authority which en-  
 ‘ joined it\*.’—Dr. WATERLAND: ‘ Positive duties  
 ‘ stand upon a moral spot—To obey God in whatso-  
 ‘ ever he commands, is the first moral law, and the  
 ‘ fundamental principle of all morality. The reason  
 ‘ of things, and the relation we bear to God, require  
 ‘ that God should be obeyed in matters otherwise *indif-*  
 ‘ *ferent*: and such obedience is *moral*, and the oppo-  
 ‘ site disobedience *immoral*—*Positives*, therefore, while  
 ‘ under precept, cannot be slighted without slighting  
 ‘ *morals* also. In short, positive laws, as soon as enact-  
 ‘ ed, become part of moral law; because, as I said,  
 ‘ universal obedience to God’s commands, is the first  
 ‘ moral law into which all laws resolve—When-  
 ‘ ever positive duties are so performed as to become  
 ‘ true obedience, they are as valuable in God’s sight,  
 ‘ as any moral performances whatever, because obey-  
 ‘ ing God’s voice is all in all. Obedience was the  
 ‘ thing insisted upon with Adam, with Abraham, with  
 ‘ Saul, and with many others, in positive instances;  
 ‘ and God laid as great a stress upon obedience there,  
 ‘ as in any moral instances whatever. To conclude  
 ‘ then, moral performances without the obedience of  
 ‘ the heart, are nothing; and positive performances  
 ‘ without the like obedience, are nothing: but the sin-  
 ‘ cere obeying of God’s voice in both, is true religion  
 ‘ and true morality†.’—Mr. REYNOLDS: ‘ To  
 ‘ call some law *moral*, in contradistinction from other  
 ‘ law, as if it was not moral at all, is improper enough.  
 ‘ Every law, properly so called, is *regula moralis*, or  
 ‘ *regula morum*; an obliging rule for the moral crea-  
 ‘ ture, to walk or act by—Positive commands are

\* *Sermons before University of Oxford*, p. 130, Edit. 2d. † *Scripture vindicated*, Part III. p. 37, 71, 72.

' more easily transgressed, than those that bear hard  
 ' upon the light and law of nature. The seeming in-  
 ' difference of the subject, or matter, in which they  
 ' are concerned, allays the awe, and fear, and distance,  
 ' that attends more criminal matter\*.' — Mr. WADSWORTH: ' Some may say, — *Sure, God will not be so*  
 ' *much concerned with a failure in so small a punctilio*  
 ' *as a ceremony!* True, it [the Lord's supper] is a ce-  
 ' remony; but it is such an one that beareth the stamp  
 ' of the authority of the Lord Jesus. If He appoints  
 ' it, will you slight it, and say, *It is but a ceremony?* —  
 ' It is but a ceremony; but you are greatly mistaken  
 ' if you think that therefore there is no danger to  
 ' neglect it. What was the tree of knowledge of good  
 ' and evil, but a ceremony? Yet, for disobedience in  
 ' eating thereof, do you not know and feel what wrath  
 ' it hath brought on the whole race of mankind?  
 ' And tell me, was circumcision any more than a ce-  
 ' remony? Yet it had almost cost Moses his life for  
 ' neglecting to circumcise his son; for the Angel  
 ' stood ready with his sword to slay him, if he  
 ' had not prevented it by his obedience, Exod. iv.  
 ' 24, 25, 26. So, for the Lord's supper, as much a  
 ' ceremony as it is, yet for the abuse of it, some  
 ' of the church [at Corinth] were sick and weak,  
 ' others fell asleep, that is, died: and if God did  
 ' so severely punish the abuse, how think you to  
 ' escape, that *presumptuously neglect* the use there-  
 ' of? *But I am regenerate and become a new crea-*  
 ' *ture; — I do not fear that God will cast me away for*  
 ' *the disuse of a ceremony.* Is this the reasoning of  
 ' one regenerate? Surely, thou dost not understand  
 ' what regeneration meaneth. Is it not the same with

\* *Inquiries concerning Angelical Worlds*, p. 11, 12, 15.

‘being born of God?’ And what is it to be obedient to the Father, but to do as he commandeth? And hath he not commanded you by his Son, to remember your Saviour in this supper? When you have considered this, then tell me what you think of this kind of reasoning; *I am a child of God, therefore I will presume to disobey him. He bids me remember Jesus in this supper, and I will not.* Methinks thou bluntest at the very mentioning of it. And what, if he should not cast thee quite off for this neglect? yet thou hast no reason to think, but that either outwardly, or inwardly, or both, he will scourge thee for this sin before thou diest\*.—

—This reasoning, it is plain, *mutatis mutandis*, applies with equal force to a neglect of baptism: to which I will add the following passage from Dr. OWEN: ‘Slaves take liberty *from* duty; children have liberty *in* duty. There is not a greater mistake in the world, than that the liberty of sons in the house of God consists in this, They can *perform* duties, or take the freedom to *omit* them: they can serve in the family of God, that is, they think they may if they *will*, and they can choose whether they will or no. This is a liberty *stolen* by slaves; not a liberty *given* by the Spirit, unto sons†.’

It is well observed by CHAMIER, and it is a dictate of common sense, ‘That no law derives its authority from the judgment, [or the inclination,] of those to whom it is given‡.’ And it is equally clear, that when a law has been fairly promulged, ignorance of its demands cannot render a noncompliance innocent. For, as Dr. WATERLAND observes, the law presumes,

\* Supplem. to Morn. Exercise at Cripplegate, p. 243. 214. † Communion with God, Part II. Chap. x. p. 246. ‡ Pantheol. Tom. I. L. VI. C. xx. § 1.

that when a man has done an ill thing, [or neglected his duty,] he either *knew* that it was evil, or else *ought* to have known it. *Ignorantia Juris non excusat delictum*\*.' It is therefore incumbent on every professor of Christianity, to make a diligent and impartial search into the records of the New Testament, that he may know and perform the will of his Lord, respecting baptism. Nor has any one reason to consider himself as possessed of a pious and virtuous temper, while destitute of a disposition to make such an enquiry. Because 'virtue, says HEINECCIUS, is always united with an earnest indefatigable care to understand the divine law. The greater progress one has made in virtue, the more ardent is this desire in his breast.' Nay, though a person should plead *conscience* for the omission or corruption of a positive institute, he would not be excused: for, as the last mentioned Author justly observes, 'Though he be guilty who acts contrary to his conscience, whether certain or probable; yet he cannot for that reason be said to act rightly and justly, who contends that he has acted according to his conscience. Conscience is not the *rule*, but it applies the rule to facts and cases which occur—He who follows an erroneous conscience sins on this very account, *That he follows it rather than the will of the Legislator*: though he be more excusable than one who acts directly against conscience, yet he is guilty†.' The morality of our conduct does not depend on the understanding; for our knowing, or being ignorant of a thing, is not the reason of its being good or evil; any more than the nature of an action does upon the will; because the willing a bad action to a good end, cannot render it

\* *Impart. of Doct. of Trin.* p. 164.  
 Chap. ii. § 37, 45.

† *Universal Law*, B. I.

innocent. Divine law is the rule of our conduct; and a want of conformity to that rule is a sin.

It appears, therefore, by the preceding reasoning, and from the Authors produced, that none are worthy the name of Christians who are destitute of a disposition to acknowledge the authority of Christ by submission to his positive appointments; and, that ignorance of their nature, obligation, and use, is far from excusing, except it arise from *natural* incapacity, and not from a bad state of the will. Now in regard to baptism, we have not only the command of our Lord, but his own *example* also, to enforce our observance of it; concerning which, Mr. WESLEY very properly says: 'Let our Lord's submitting to baptism, teach us an holy exactness in the observance of those institutions which owe their obligation merely to a divine command. Surely, *thus it becometh* all his followers *to fulfil all righteousness*\*.' It has been justly remarked by a learned Lutheran, 'That so great an honour was never conferred upon any ceremony† as there was upon baptism, when our Lord himself was immersed in Jordan, by the hands of John; when the Divine Father, with an audible voice, proclaimed him his beloved Son; and when the Holy Spirit descended upon him.

I will conclude this part of our subject with the reasoning of Dr. GERARD. 'A total disregard to the positive and external duties of religion, or a very great neglect of them, is justly reckoned more blameable, and a stronger evidence of an unprincipled character, than even some transgressions of moral obligation—Even particular positive precepts, as soon as they are given by God, have some-

\* Note on Matt. iii. 16.  
p. 113.

† Centur. Magdeb. Cent. I. L. I. C. iv.



thing *moral* in their nature. Suppose the rites  
 which are enjoined by them, perfectly indifferent  
 before they were enjoined; yet from that moment  
 they cease to be indifferent. The divine authority  
 is interposed for the observance of them. To neglect  
 them is no longer to forbear an indifferent action,  
 or to do a thing in one way rather than another,  
 which has naturally no greater propriety: it is very  
 different; it is to disobey God, it is to despise his  
 authority, it is to resist his will. Can any man be-  
 lieve a God, and not acknowledge that disobedience  
 to him and contempt of his authority is *immoral*,  
 and far from the least heinous species of immora-  
 lity?—All positive institutions of divine appoint-  
 ment, are means of cultivating moral virtue. Be-  
 the rites themselves what they will, their being en-  
 joined by God, renders them proper trials of our  
 obedience to him, and renders our observance of  
 them the means of cherishing a sense of his autho-  
 rity, and of improving a principle of subjection to  
 it. A principle of subjection to the authority of  
 God, is one of the firmest supports of all goodness  
 and virtue: and positive institutions are the most  
 direct means of cultivating it; for the observance  
 of them proceeds solely from the principle of obe-  
 dience; but in every moral virtue, other principles  
 are conjoined with this. All the rites appointed  
 by God, are likewise direct and very powerful  
 means of improving many particular virtuous affec-  
 tions, all the affections which are naturally exer-  
 cised in performing them. Neglect of the *means*  
 demonstrates, in every case, indifference about the  
*end*. Disregard to external worship and positive  
 institutions, shows the want of all concern for mo-  
 ral improvement. But unconcern for moral im-  
 provement

‘provement is not the defect of a single virtue, is not a single vice; it is a corruption and degeneracy of the *whole soul*, and therefore must appear highly detestable to every person of sound and unbiassed judgment—It is not they who reckon a regard to positive institutions essential to a good and unblemished character, that judge weakly, but they who reckon that regard of no importance. Vain are their pretensions to enlargement of sentiment and elevation above prejudice; their minds are so contracted, that they can admit only a partial idea of the nature of positive duties; they consider but the mere matter of them; they comprehend not their moral principles, their sublime end, or their important signification \*.’

As the leading ideas in the preceding paragraphs are the *grand principles* of legitimate reasoning on the doctrine of Positive Institutions; as it is on these principles that our most eminent Protestant Authors proceed, when exploding the superstitions of Popery; and as it is our intention to examine Pædobaptism on these very principles; the reader is desired to keep them in mind, while perusing the following pages. It has been justly remarked by Bp. TAYLOR, that ‘men are easy enough to consent to a general rule; but they will not suffer their *own case* to be concerned in it†.’ This observation is, doubtless, founded in fact, and it expresses an affecting truth. While, therefore, we consider the forementioned authors as having verified the remark by practising Infant Sprinkling; we shall endeavour to avoid a similar inconsistency.

\* *Sermons*, Vol. I. p. 312—314. 316, 317, 320. Edit. 2d.

† *Ductor Dubitant*. B. II. Chap. iii. p. 303.

## CHAPTER II.

*Concerning the Signification of the Terms, Baptize, and Baptism.*

N. B. To prevent mistakes, the Reader is desired to observe, That many of the following quotations are to be considered as *concessions* made by these learned authors; no inconsiderable part of them asserting, notwithstanding what they here say, that the word baptism signifies pouring and sprinkling, as well as immersion.

WITSIUS: "It cannot be denied, that the native signification of the word βαπτειν, and βαπτίζειν, is to plunge, to dip. So that it is, doubtless, more than επιπολαζειν, which is to swim lightly on the surface; but less than δυνειν, which is to go down to the bottom and be destroyed—"Yet I have observed, that the word καταδυσις is frequently used by the ancients, with reference to baptism." *OEcon. Fœd.* L. IV. C. xvi. § 13.

2. SALMASIUS: "*Baptism*, is immersion; and was administered, in ancient times, according to the force and meaning of the word. Now it is only *rhantism*, or sprinkling; not *immersion*, or dipping." *De Casarie Virorum*, p. 669.

3. GURTLEUS: "*To baptize*, among the Greeks, is undoubtedly to immerse, to dip; and baptism, is immersion, dipping. Βαπτισμος εν Πνευματι αγιω, *baptism in the Holy Spirit*, is immersion into the pure waters of the Holy Spirit; or a rich and abundant communication of his gifts: for he on whom the Holy Spirit is poured

poured out, is, as it were, immersed into him.—*Βαπτισμος εν πυρι*, baptism in fire, is a figurative expression, and signifies casting into a flame, which, like water, flows far and wide; such as the flame that consumed Jerusalem.—The thing commanded by our Lord, is baptism; immersion into water.” *Institut. Theol. Cap. xxxiii. § 108, 109, 110, 115.*

4. DANÆUS: “*Βαπτισμος*, baptism, is derived *απο του βαπτεσθαι*, or *βαπτιζεσθαι*: the former of which properly signifies *to dye*; the latter, *to immerse*, especially in water. But, as that which emerges out of the water appears to be washed, and fair, and clean; so the term baptism is frequently used in the holy Scripture, for washing and cleansing.” In LEIGH’S *Critica Sacra*, under the word, *Βαπτισμος*. Edit. 2d.

5. GOMARUS: “*Βαπτισμος* and *Βαπτισμα*,—signify the act of baptizing: that is, either plunging alone; or immersion, and the consequent washing.” *Opera, Disputat. Theolog. Disput. xxxii. § 5.*

6. BUDDEUS: “The words *βαπτίζειν* and *βαπτισμος*, are not to be interpreted of aspersion, but always of immersion.” *Theolog. Dogmat. L. V. C. i. § 5.*

7. DR. BENTLEY: “*Βαπτισμους*, baptisms, dippings—*Βαπτισον σεαυτον εις θαλασσαν*, dip yourself in the sea.” *Remarks on Disc. on Free Thinking, Part II. p. 56, 57.* Edit. 6.

8. BR. REYNOLDS: “The Spirit under the gospel, is compared—to water; and that not a little measure, to sprinkle, or bedew, but to baptize the faithful in, Matt. iii. 11. Acts i. 5. and that not in a font, or vessel, which grows less and less, but in a spring, or living river, Joh. vii. 39.—There are two words—which signify suffering of afflictions, and they are both applied unto Christ, Matt. xx. 22. Are ye able to drink of the cup that I shall drink of, or be baptized with

with that baptism that I am baptized with? ~~He~~ that drinketh hath the water in him; he that is dipped or plunged, hath the water about him: ~~for~~ it notes the universality of the wrath which Christ suffered." *Works*, p. 226, 407.

9. CALVIN: "The word baptize, signifies to immerse; and the rite of immersion was observed by the ancient church." *Instit. Christ. Relig.* L.IV. C. xv. § 19.

10. BEZA: "Christ commanded us to be baptized; by which word it is certain immersion is signified—*Βαπτίζεσθαι*, in this place, is more than *χερσιν*... because *that* seems to respect the whole body, *us* only the hands. Nor does *βαπτίζειν* signify to wash, except by consequence: for it properly signifies to immerse for the sake of dyeing—To be baptized in water, signifies no other than to be immersed in water; which is the external ceremony of baptism—*Βαπτίζω* differs from *τὸ ἐν ῥύδναι*, which signifies, to plunge in the deep and to drown; as appears from that verse of an ancient oracle, *Ἀδὸς βαπτίζη, δύναι δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ* *εἰ*: in which these two terms are distinguished, as expressing different ideas." *Epistola* II. ad THOM. TILYUM, (apud SPANHEM. *Dub. Evang.* Pars III. Dub. 24.) *Annotat.* in Marc. vii. 4. Act. xix. 3. Matt. iii. 11.

11. MEISNERUS: "*Βαπτίζειν*, and *βαπτειν*, are generally found used for plunging and a total immersion." Apud SPANHEM. *Dub. Evangel.* Pars III. Dub. xxiv. § 2.

12. DANISH CATECHISM: "What is Christian dipping? Water, in conjunction with the word and command of Christ. What is that command which is in conjunction with water? *Go teach all nations*, and so on, Matt. xxviii. 19. Mark xvi. 15, 16. What

is implied in these words? A command to the dipper and the dipped, with a promise of salvation to those that believe. How is this Christian dipping to be administered? The person must be deep-dipped in water, or overwhelmed with it, in the Name of God the Father, and so on." N. B. The Gentleman who favoured me with this extract observes; That βαπτίζω is translated, by the Germans, *tauff*; by the Dutch, *doop*; by the Danes and Swedes, *døbe*; all which signify, to dip.

13. SPANHEMIUS: "Βαπτίζειν and Βαπτειν, are generally found used for plunging, or a total dipping." *Gab. Erang. Pars III. Dub. xxiv. § 2.*

14. VITRINGA: "The act of baptizing, is the immersion of believers in water. This expresses the force of the word. Thus also it was performed by Christ and his apostles." *Aphorismi Sancti Theolog. Aphorif. 884.*

15. BUCHMANUS: "Baptism, according to the force of its etymology, is immersion, and washing, or dipping." *Exercit. Theolog. Exercit. xvii. p. 257.*

16. BUCANUS: "Baptism, that is, immersion, dipping, and, by consequence, washing. Baptistry, a vat, or large vessel of wood, or stone, in which we are immersed, for the sake of washing. Baptist, one that immerses, or dips." *Institut. Theolog. Loc. XLVII. Quæst. i. p. 605.*

17. Bp. PATRICK: "I may say of him [Mr. JOHN SMITH] in ANTONINUS his phrase, he was δικαιοσύνην βεβαμμενος εις βάθος, DIP'D into justice, as it were, over head and ears; he had not a slight superficial tincture, but was dyed and coloured quite through with it." *Funeral Sermon for Mr. J. SMITH of Cambridge, subjoined to his Select Discourses, p. 509.*

18. ZAN-

18. ZANCHIUS: "Baptism is a Greek word, and signifies two things: first, and properly, immersion in water. For the proper signification of βαπτίζω, is to immerse, to plunge under, to overwhelm in water—And this signification properly agrees with our baptism, and has a resemblance of the thing signified." *Opera*, Tom. VI. p. 217. Genev. 1619. N. B. Mr. DE COURCY tells us, that the opinion of ZANCHIUS 'is worth a thousand others.' *Rejoinder*, p. 261.

19. HOORNBEEKIUS: "We do not deny that the word baptism bears the sense of immersion; or that, in the first examples of persons baptized, they went into the water and were immersed; or that this rite should be observed where it may be done conveniently and without endangering health." *Socin. Confut.* L. III. C. II. Sect. I. Tom. III. p. 268.

20. STAPPERUS: "By baptism we understand that rite of the New Testament church, commanded by Christ, in which believers, by being immersed in water, testify their communion with the church." *Institut. Theolog. Polem.* Tom. I. Cap. iii. § 1635.

21. BURMANNUS: "Βαπτισμος and βαπτισμα, if you consider their etymology, properly signify immersion. *And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water.* Matt. iii. 16. Compare Acts viii. 38." *Synops. Theolog.* Loc. XLIII. Cap. vi. § 2.

22. ROELI: "Baptism, from βαπτω, signifies immersion." *Explicat. Epist. ad Ephesios*, ad Cap. iv. 5.

23. Mr. JOHN TRAPP: "Are ye able to—be baptized with the baptism; or plunged over head and ears in the deep waters of affliction?" *Comment. on Matt.* xx. 22.

24. LIMBORCH: "Baptism is that rite, or ceremony, of the New Covenant, whereby the faithful,  
by

by immersion into water, as by a sacred pledge, are assured of the favour of God, remission of sins, and eternal life; and by which they engage themselves to an amendment of life, and an obedience to the divine commands." *Compleat Syst. Div. B. V. Chap. XXII. Sect. i. Mr. JONES's Translation.*

25. H. ALTINGIUS: "The word baptism—properly signifies immersion; improperly, by a metonymy of the end, washing." *Loci Commun. Pars I. Loc. XII. p. 198.*

26. HOSPINIANUS: "Christ commanded us to be baptized; by which word it is certain immersion is signified." *Hist. Sacram. L. II. C. i. p. 30.*

27. CASAUBONUS: "This was the rite of baptizing, that persons were plunged into the water; which the very word βαπτίζειν, to baptize, sufficiently declares—Which as it does not signify δυεῖν, to sink to the bottom and perish; so, doubtless, it is not επιπλεάζειν, to swim on the surface. For these three words, επιπλεάζειν, βαπτίζειν and δυεῖν, are of different significations. Whence we understand it was not without reason, that some long ago insisted on the immersion of the whole body in the ceremony of baptism: for they urge the word βαπτίζειν, to baptize." *Annotat. in Matt. iii. 6.*

28. DIODATI: "Baptized; viz. plunged in water—In baptism, being dipped in water according to the ancient ceremony, it is a sacred figure unto us, that sin ought to be drowned in us, by God's Spirit." *Annotat. on Matt. iii. 6. Rom. vi. 4.*

29. CALMET: "Generally people [speaking of the Jews] dipped themselves entirely under the water; and this is the most simple and natural notion of the word baptisin." *Dict. of Bible, ART. BAPTISM.*



30. LUTHER. "The term baptism, is a Greek word. It may be rendered a dipping, when we dip something in water, that it may be entirely covered with water. And though that custom be quite abolished among the generality (for neither do they entirely dip children, but only sprinkle them with a little water;) nevertheless they ought to be wholly immersed, and presently to be drawn out again. For the etymology of the word seems to require it. The Germans call baptism *tauff*, from *depth*, which they call *teuff*, in their language; as if it were proper those should be *deeply immersed*, who are baptized. And, truly, if you consider what baptism signifies, you shall see the same thing required: for it signifies that the old man and our nativity, that is full of sins, which is entirely of flesh and blood, may be overwhelmed by divine grace. The manner of baptism, therefore, should correspond to the signification of baptism, that it may show a certain and plain sign of it." In Dr. DU VEIL, on Acts viii. 38.

31. SCHELHORNIIUS, when explaining 1 Cor. xv. 29, and understanding the word *baptized* in a metaphorical sense, as expressive of being overwhelmed in calamities, says; "The word βαπτίζεσθαι, which properly signifies to be immersed, or plunged under water; though not so frequently used by profane authors in a metaphorical sense, is nevertheless not unusual\*." *Biblioth. Bremens.* Class. vii. p. 638.

32., Mr.

\* In confirmation of which he produces the following authorities, which I will give in his own words. "HELIODORUS, L. II. C. iii. *Æthiopic*. CNEMON itaque cum omnino dolo illum succubuisse et calamitate submersum (συμφορῇ βιβαντισμένον) esse intellexisset, metueretque, ne sibi aliquid mali confisceret. L. IV. C. xx. O vos, qui adestis, Charcli quidem et postea lugere licebit. Nos

32. MR. SEEDEN: "In England, of late years, I ever thought the parson baptized his own fingers, rather than the child." *Works*, Vol. VI. Col. 2008.

33. KECHELMANNUS: "We cannot deny, that the first institution of baptism consisted in immersion, and not sprinkling; which is quite evident from Rom. vi. 3, 4." *System. Theolog.* L. III. C. viii p. 369.

34. Dr. TOWERSON: "The third thing to be enquired concerning the outward visible sign of baptism is, how it ought to be applied;—whether—by an immersion,—or an aspersion, or effusion—A more\* material question [this] than it is commonly deemed by us, who have been accustomed to baptize by a bare effusion, or sprinkling of water upon the party. For in things which depend for their force upon the mere will and pleasure of him who instituted them, there ought, no doubt, great regard to be

vero non *mergamur* (συμβαπτιζομεθα) hujus dolore, neque inconsiderate illius lacrymis, tanquam aquæ impetu autiamur, occasionem negligentes. L. V. C. xvi. *Επειδη σε τα συμβιβηκολα βαπτιζον*, quoniam te casus tui obruebant ac *demergebant*. Ita et eo sensu venit L. II. C. xxvii. ejusdem autoris verbum *βυθιζοθαι*. *Ποισι κλυδωνι κακων βυθουθισμοις*, majore fluctu arummatum, obruti-----  
LIBANIUS, (In *Parent. Juliani*, Cap. cclviii. p. 369.) Ea enim, quam ob Julianum sentimus, tristitia, animam *submergens* (βαπτιζουσα) mentemque obsufcans, tenebras quasdam oculis quoque obfundit, nec multum ab iis, qui in tenebris nunc vertantur, distamus.  
PLUTARCHUS: (*De Puerorum Educatione*, Cap. xiii.) Sicut enim plantæ quidem mediocribus aquis nutriuntur, plurimis vero suffocantur. Ad eundem modum anima quidem mediocribus augetur laboribus, sed immoderatis (βαπτιζιται) *submergitur*. Ita et Poeta anonymus: (*Anthol.* Gr. L. II. C. xlvii.) *Βαπτιζιθαι* ad somnum transire-----

*Βαπτιζιται δ' ὑπὸ γήινῳ τε θανάτῳ.*

Vides heic *βαπτιζιθαι τῷ ὕπνῳ* esse per metaphoram somno *seperiri*, quam phrasin etiam alicubi in HELLIOBORO legisse memini." *Uti supra*, p. 638, 639, 640.

had to the commands of him who did so; as without which there is no reason to presume we shall receive the benefit of that ceremony, to which he hath been pleased to annex it. Now, what the command of Christ was in this particular, cannot well be doubted of by those who shall consider the words of Christ, Matt. xxviii. 19. concerning it, and the practice of those times, whether in the baptism of John, or of our Saviour. For the words of Christ are, that they should baptize, or *βπτίζουσιν*, those whom they made disciples to him (for so, no doubt, the word *βπτίζειν* properly signifies;) and which is more, and not without its weight, that they should baptize them *into* the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Thereby intimating such a washing, as should receive the party baptized within the very body of the water, which they were to baptize him with. Though if there could be any doubt concerning the signification of the words in themselves, yet would that doubt be removed by considering the practice of those times, whether in the baptism of John, or of our Saviour. For such as was the practice of those times in baptizing, such in reason are we to think our Saviour's command to have been concerning it, especially when the words themselves incline that way: there being not otherwise any means, either for those, or future times, to discover his intention concerning it." *Of the Sacram. of Bap. Part III. p. 53, 54, 55.*

35. DAN. GRADE: "The word baptism generally denotes immersion, for the sake of washing or cleansing." In *Theaur. Theolog. Philolog.* Tom. II. p. 560.

36. H. CLIGNETUS: "Baptism is so called from immersion, or plunging into; because in the primitive  
 tive

tive times those that were baptized were entirely immersed in water." In *Theſaur. Diſputat. Sedan.* Tom. I. p. 169, 770. Genev. 1661.

37. Dr. DAN. SCOTT: "The verb βαπτίζω expreſſes the form of admitting a proſelyte into the Chriſtian church, which tradition aſſures us was by a trine immerſion, or plunging under water. But of late aſperſion, or ſprinkling, is admitted by the Church of England inſtead of immerſion or dipping\*." *New Verſion of St. Matt. Goſpel.* Note on Matt. xxviii. 19.

38. BOSSUET: "To baptize ſignifies to plunge, as is granted by all the world." In Mr. STENNETT, againſt Mr. RUSSEN, p. 174.

39. SUICERUS: "He is ſaid, βαπτειν ὑδραν, to baptize a bucket, who draws water out of a well or a river; which cannot be done except the bucket be entirely plunged under the water. Wool and clothes are ſaid to be βαπτεσθαι, baptized, when they are dipped; becauſe they are quite immerſed in the dyeing ſat, that they may imbibe the colour. Βαπτίζω, to baptize, hath properly the ſame ſignification—Βαπ-

\* To fix the ſignification of βαπτίζω, he produces a number of paſſages from the following Greek authors; JOSEPH. *Antiq. Jud.* L. IV. C. iv. § 6. p. 207. L. XV. C. iii. § 3. p. 745. *De Bell. Jud.* L. I. C. xxii. § 2. p. 110. L. I. C. xxvii. § 1. L. II. C. xviii. § 4. p. 198. L. II. C. xx. § 1. L. III. C. ix. § 3. p. 251. L. III. C. x. § 9. p. 259. STRAB. *Geogr.* L. i. p. 44. B. L. xii. p. 809. D. I. xvi. p. 1168. LUCIAN. *Ver. Hiſt.* L. ii. p. 393. A. P. IUGARCH. *Quæſt. Nat. Thom.* II. p. 914. C. ORPH. *Argonaut.* V. 510. SOPH. *Aj.* V. 354. In the ſame learned Author's *Append. ad Theſaur. Græc. Ling.* under the verb βαπτίζω, he quotes paſſages from the following Greek writers; POLYN. *Hiſt.* L. i. p. 73. ult. 545. 10. f. L. iii. p. 311. ult. JOSEPH. *Antiq.* L. IX. C. x. § 2. *Vita*, § 3. DIOD. SICUL. *Bibl.* L. i. p. 23. 12. STRAB. *Geogr.* L. i. p. 421. C. L. xiv. p. 982. D. ATHEN. *Deſign.* L. v. p. 221. C. 472. D. LUCIAN. *Bacch.* p. 853. A. PLAT. *Fathyden.* i. 277. C. DIOD. SICUL. L. i. p. 47. 4. JOSEPH. *De Bell.* L. IV. C. iii. § 3.

τιζειν εαυτον εις θαλασσαν, in the ancient Poet, is, *to plunge himself into the sea*.—From the proper signification of the verb, *baptizo*, baptism properly denotes immersion, or dipping into." *Theſaurus Ecclef.* sub voce ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΑ.

40. VENEMA: "The word βαπτίζειν, *to baptize*—is no where used in the Scripture for sprinkling; no not in Mark vii. 4. otherwise than appears to some." *Institut. Hist. Ecclef. Vet. et Nov. Test.* Tom. III. Scetul. i. § 138.

41. MAGDEBURG CENTURIATORS: "The word βαπτίζω, *to baptize*, which signifies immersion into water, proves that the administrator of baptism immersed, or washed, the persons baptized in water." Cent. I. L. II. C. vi. p. 382.

42. ANONYMOUS: "The word *baptize* doth certainly signify *immersion*, *absolute* and *total* immersion, in JOSEPHUS and other Greek writers. But this word is in some degree equivocal; and there are some eminent Greek scholars who have asserted, that immersion is not *necessarily* included in baptism. The examples produced, however, do not exactly serve the cause of those who think that a few drops of water sprinkled on the forehead of a child, constitute the essence of baptism. In the Septuagint it is said, that Nebuchadnezzar *was baptized with the dew of heaven*: and in a poem attributed to HOMER (called) *The Battle of the Frogs and Mice*, it is said, that *a lake was baptized with the blood of a wounded combatant*. (Εβάπττετο δ' αἵματι λίμνη πορφυρεῖ.) A question hath arisen, in what sense the word *baptize* can be used in this passage. Doth it signify immersion, properly so called? Certainly not: neither can it signify a partial sprinkling. A body wholly surrounded with a mist; wholly made humid with dew; or a piece of  
water

water so tinged with and discoloured by blood, that if it had been a solid body and dipped into it, it could not have received a more sanguine appearance, is a very different thing from that partial application which in modern times is supposed sufficient to constitute full and explicit baptism. The accommodation of the word *baptism* to the instances we have referred to, is not unnatural, though highly metaphorical; and may be resolved into a trope or figure of speech, in which though the primary idea is maintained, yet the mode of expression is altered; and the word itself is to be understood rather *allusively* than *really*; rather *relatively* than *absolutely*. If a body had been baptized or immersed, it could not have been more wet than Nebuchadnezzar's; if a lake had been dipped in blood, it could not have put on a more bloody appearance—Hitherto the Anti-Pædobaptists seem to have had the best of the argument, on the mode of administering the ordinance. The most explicit authorities are on their side. Their opponents have chiefly availed themselves of inferences, analogy, and doubtful construction." *Monthly Review*, for May, 1784, p. 396.

43. G. J. VOSSIUS: "*Βαπτίζειν*, to baptize, signifies to plunge—It certainly therefore signifies more than *επιπολαζειν*, which is, *to swim lightly on the top*; and less than *δυνειν*, which is, *to sink to the bottom*, so as to be destroyed." *Disputat. de Bap.* Disp. I. Thef. i. p. 25. Amstelod. 1648.

44. Mr. DE COURCY: "It is readily allowed, that dipping is one of the included ideas in the original word [*βαπτισω*.]—We never denied, that dipping is not excluded from the signification of the original word." *Rejoinder*, p. 139, 143.

45. TURRETTINUS: "The word *baptism* is of Greek origin, and is derived from the verb *βαπτω*;

which signifies *to dip*, and *to dye*: βαπτίζειν, *to baptize*; to dip into, to immerse. PLUT. *de Superstit.* βαπτισον σε εις θαλασσαν, *plunge yourself into the sea*: and, in the life of THESEUS he recites a Sibylline verse concerning the Athenians, which better agrees to the church:

Ασχος βαπτίζει, δυναι δε τοι ου' θειαις εσι.

MERGERIS *uter aquis, sed non SUBMERGERIS unquam.*

Hence it appears, that βαπτίζειν is more than επιπολεζειν, which is *to swim lightly on the surface*; and less than δουειν, which is *to go down to the bottom*; that is, to strike the bottom so as to be destroyed." *Institut. Loc. XIX. Quæst. xi. § 4.*

46. DR. OWEN: "Though the *original and natural* signification of the word [βαπτίζω] imports, to dip, to plunge, to dye; yet it also signifies to wash or cleanse." In Dr. RIDGLEY's *Bod. Div. Quæst. clxvi. p. 608. Note.*

47. BAS. FABER: "Baptism, is immersion, washing." *Thesaur. Erudit. Scholast. Lips. 1717.*

48. ERAS. SCHIMIDIUS: "Βαπτειν, is to dye, to immerse in water—Also to wash, or to immerse for the sake of washing or cleansing." *Annotat. in Matt. iii. 6. Norimb. 1658.*

49. MR. DANIEL ROGERS: "None, of old, were wont to be sprinkled; and I confess myself unconvinced by demonstration of Scripture for infants' sprinkling. It ought to be the church's part to cleave to the institution, which is dipping; and he belays the church, whose officer he is, to a disorderly ~~act~~, if he cleave not to the institution, which is to ~~dip~~. That the minister is to dip in water, as the ~~act~~ itself act, the word βαπτίζω notes it. For the Greeks wanted

would not other words to express any other act besides dipping, if the institution could bear it. What resemblance of the burial or the resurrection of Christ is in sprinkling? All antiquity and scripture confirm that way. To dip, therefore, is *exceeding material* to the ordinance; which was the usage of old, without exception of countries, hot, or cold." In Dr. RUSSELL'S *Just Vind. of Doc. and Prac. of John*, &c. Epist. Dedicat. p. 5.

50. Dr. HAMMOND: "The word here used, βαπτίζεσθαι, (as it differs from νίπτεσθαι verse 3.) signifies not only the washing of the whole body, (as when 'tis said of EUROLIS—that being taken and thrown into the sea, εβαπτίζετο, he was immersed all over, and so the baptisms of cups, &c. in the end of this verse, is putting into *water all over*, rinsing them) but washing any part as the hands here, by way of immersion in water, as that is opposed to affusion or pouring water on them." *Annotations*, on Mark vii. 4.

51. IKENIUS: "The Greek word βαπτισμός denotes the immersion of a thing, or a person, into something; either with a view to expiation, or for washing and cleansing. Here also [Matt. iii. 11. compared with Luke iii. 16.] the *baptism of fire*, or that which is performed in fire, must signify, according to the same simplicity of the letter, an immersion, or immersion, into fire for a similar end: and this rather, because here, *to baptize in the Spirit*, and *in fire*, are not only connected, but also opposed to being baptized *in water*; and, therefore, the connection of the discourse, and the laws of opposition demand, that after whatever manner these two phrases denote baptism in water, and in the Spirit, to be performed, such must that be which is performed in



—The Jewish rites of purification were different; for, either they were performed by an immersion of the whole body, which the Jews call *קִבּוּץ*, and the Greeks, *βαπτισμον*, baptism; or by the washing of some parts, as the hands, or the feet, which is called by the Greeks, *ἐκνίψις*; or by sprinkling—which, in Greek, is denominated *παντισμος*, *hantism*." *Dissert. Philolog. Theolog.* Dissert. xix. p. 325. *Antiq. Hebraica*, Pars I. C. xviii. § 9.

52. DEYLINGIUS: "The word *βαπτιζεσθαι*, as used by Greek authors, signifies immersion and overwhelming. Thus we read in PLUTARCH, *de Superstit.* Tom. II. Op. f. 166. *βαπτισον σεαυτον εις θαλασσαν*, *dip yourself in the sea*: like as Naaman, in 2 Kings v. 14. who BAPTIZED *himself seven times in Jordan*, which was an immersion of the whole body. So STRABO, Lib. xiv. p. 458. when speaking about the soldiers of ALEXANDER the Great, marching in the winter season between Climax, a mountain in Pamphilia, and the sea, says; *They were immersed*, *βαπτιζομενους*, up to the waist. The same author, Lib. xii. p. 391. speaking of Tatta, a marsh, situate between Galatia and Cappadocia, says; *The water rises*, *παντι τω βαπτισθεντι εις αυτο*, *so as to overwhelm anything*. DIODORUS SICULUS, Lib. I. C. xxvi. when speaking of the Nile overflowing its banks, says; *Many of the land animals perish*, *υπο του ποταμου περιληφθεντα διαφθειρεσθαι βαπτιζομενα*, *being overtaken and overwhelmed by the flood*. In JOSEPHUS, *Antiq. Jud.* Lib. XV. Cap. iii. *βαπτιζοντες*, *persons baptizing*, are persons plunging down. It has the same signification in the Gospels, and in the writings of the Apostles: if you except Luke xi. 38. where *βαπτιζεσθαι* seems to be used concerning washing the hands, which is done by sprinkling."

*Observat.*

**Obsequ. Sac. Part III. Obsequ. xxi. § 2. Lipl.**  
 1715.

53. **LE CLERC**: "At that time came John the Baptizer. He has been called the Baptizer, rather than Baptist, because the latter word is a proper name in the modern languages; whereas in this place it is an appellative, to signify a man that plunged in water those who testified an acknowledgment of his divine mission, and were desirous of leading a new life—He shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit. As I plunge you in water, he shall plunge you, so to speak, in the Holy Spirit." *Remarques sur Nouv. Test. à Matt. iii. 1.*

54. **DANZIUS**: "ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΟΣ, ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΑ, and ΒΑΠΤΙΣ, denote plunging, or dipping; also washing, or a bath." *De Bap. Profelyt. Judaic. § 1. in UGOLINI Thesaurus Antiq. Sac. Tom. XXII. p. 883.*

55. **REISKIUS**: "To be baptized signifies, in its primary sense, to be immersed—Hence ναυς αβαπτιστος, a ship unbaptized, is a vessel not immersed in the waves; and, in GREGORY Thaumaturgus, a person immersed in error, is called βαβαπτισμενος; and he who rescues such persons from their dangerous mistakes, is said τους βαπτισμενους ανιμασθαι, to lift up, or draw out, the parties that were so baptized." *Dissertat. de Bap. Judæorum, Cap. i. § 1.*

56. **HEIDEGGERUS**: "The words ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΑ and ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΟΣ, baptism, (from βαπτειν, to plunge, to immerse) properly signify immersion." *Corpus Theolog. Christ. Loc. xxv. § 21.*

57. **J. J. WETSTENIUS**: "To baptize, is to plunge, to dip. The body, or part of the body, being under water, is said to be baptized." *Comment. ad Matt. iii. 6.*

58. **Dr. DODDRIDGE**: "I have, indeed,—a most dreadful baptism to be baptized with, and know

I shall shortly be bathed as it were in blood, and plunged in the most overwhelming distress." *Paraphrase on Luke xii. 50.*

59. ZEPHERUS: "If we consider the proper meaning of the term, the word baptism signifies plunging into water, or the very act of dipping and washing. It appears, therefore, from the very signification and etymology of the term, what was the custom of administering baptism in the beginning; whereas we now, for baptism, rather have rhanism, or sprinkling." In LEIGH's *Crit. Sac.* under the word *Βαπτισμος*. Lond. 1646.

60. Mr. POOLE'S CONTINUATORS: "To be baptized, is to be dipped in water; metaphorically, to be plunged in afflictions. I am, saith Christ, to be baptized with blood, overwhelmed with sufferings and afflictions." *Annotations on Matt. xx. 22.* Edit. 1688.

61. WALÆUS: "The external form of baptism is immersion into water, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." *Enchiridium*, p. 425.

62. ARTICLES OF SMALCALD: "Baptism is no other than the word of God, with plunging into water, according to his appointment and command." KROMAYERI *Epitom. Lib. Concord. Christ.* p. 107.

63. ANONYMOUS: "That the letter of the Scripture is in favour of the Baptists (or, as they are still absurdly called, Anabaptists) cannot without evasion and equivocation be denied." *London Review*, for June 1776, p. 489.

64. GERHARDUS: "Βαπτισμος and βαπτισμα, βαπτίζειν, to baptize, to immerse, to dip, and properly, into water: it has a likeness to the βαθυζω and βαθυνω, each of which signifies to down into the deep—PLUTARCH, βαπτι-

~~... ..~~  
~~... ..~~ change your self into the sea.  
 The same author mentions a Sibylline verse concern-  
 ing the Athenians, in the life of ΤΗΚΕΥΣ, which  
 you may better apply to the church of Christ ;

Ασχος βαπτίζη δυναι δε τῶι οὐ θεμις ἐστίν.

MERGERIS *uter aquis, sed non SUBMERGERIS*  
*unquam.*

The same biographer, in the life of GALBA, speaks  
 metaphorically of being *baptized*, or immersed, in  
*debt* : βεβαπτισμενος οφειλημασι. In his *Morals*, he  
 speaks of being *baptized*, or oppressed, by an accumu-  
 lation of *affairs* : βαπτιζεσθαι ὑπο των πραγμάτων.  
 In his life of PHOCION, of being *baptized in*, or  
 plunged under, *immoderate labours* : βαπτιζεσθαι τοις  
 πονοις ὑπερβαλλουσι. APHEROD. L. I. Probl. has the  
 following expressions ; βεβαπτισμενος τῷ σωματι, *plun-*  
*ged down in the body.* In this acceptance of immer-  
 sing, it is used 2 Kings v. 14. *Then went he down and*  
*dipped (εβαπτισατο) himself seven times in Jordan*

—But because those who are immersed in water,  
 and emerge out of it, appear washed and clean, there-  
 fore βαπτισμος and βαπτίζειν are consequentially used  
 for any kind of ablution ; whether it be performed by  
 merely sprinkling, or pouring, or by a particular dip-  
 ping. Βαπτίζειν is derived from βαπτειν, which signi-  
 fies, in general, to dip, to wash, to dye, to immerse.”  
*Loc. Theolog.* Tom. IV. De Bap. p. 224.

65. ALSTEDIUS : “ Βαπτίζειν, to baptize, signifies  
 only to immerse ; not to wash, except by consequence.”  
*Lexicon Theologicum*, Cap. xii. p. 221.

66. Mr. WILSON : “ To baptize, to dip into  
 water, or to plunge one into the water.” *Christian*  
*Dictionary*, Edit. 1678.

67. Mr

67. Mr. BAILEY: "Baptism, in strictness of speech, is that kind of ablution, or washing, which consists in dipping; and when applied to the Christian institution so called, it was used by the primitive Christians in no other sense than that of dipping; as the learned GROTIUS and CASAUBON well observe. But as new customs introduce new significations of words, in process of time it admitted the idea of sprinkling, as in the case of clinical baptism." *Dictionary*, Dr. SCOTT's Edit. 1772.

68. Mr. LEIGH: "Βαπτίζω. The word baptize, though it be derived from βαπτω, to dip, or plunge into the water, and signifieth primarily such a kind of washing as is used in bucks, where linen is plunged and dipt; yet it is taken more largely for any kind of washing, rinsing, or cleansing, even where there is no dipping at all; as Matt. iii. 11. and so on—The native and proper signification of it is, to dip into water, or to plunge under water, John iii. 22, 23. Matt. iii. 16. Acts viii. 38." *Critica Sacra*.

69. SCHOETTGENIUS: "Βαπτίζω, from βαπτω; properly, to plunge, to immerse; to cleanse, to wash." *Lex. in Nov. Test.* KREBSII Edit. 1765.

70. Mr. PARKHURST: "Βαπτίζω (from βαπτω, to dip) to dip, immerse, or plunge in water—To baptize, to immerse in, or wash with water—Figuratively; to be baptized, immersed, or plunged in a flood, or sea, as it were, of grievous afflictions and sufferings."

71. SCHIREVELIUS: "Βαπτίζω, to baptize, to plunge, to wash." Cantab. 1685.

72. PASOR: "Βαπτίζω, to baptize, to immerse, to wash." Lips. 1735.

73. TROMMIUS: "Βαπτίζω, to baptize; to immerse, to dip." *Concordantiæ Græcæ*, sub voce.

74. MIN-

74. MINTEST: "Βαπτίζω, to baptize properly, indeed, it signifies to plunge, to immerse, to dip into water: but because it is common to plunge or dip a thing that it may be washed, hence also it signifies to wash, to wash away—Βαπτισμός, baptism; immersion, dipping into; washing, washing away. Properly, and according to its etymology, it denotes that washing which is performed by immersion."

75. SCAPULA: "Βαπτίζω, to baptize; to dip, or immerse; as we immerse any thing for the purpose of dyeing, or cleansing in water. Also to dip, to plunge, to overwhelm in water. Likewise to wash away, to wash." Lond. 1652.

76. HEDERICUS: "Βαπτίζω, to baptize, to plunge, to immerse, to overwhelm in water; to wash away, to wash. Βαπτισμα, baptism; immersion, dipping into." Lond. 1778.

77. CONSTANTINUS: "Βαπτισμός, baptism; the act of dyeing, that is, of plunging." Edit. 1592.

78. Mr. ROBERTSON: "Βαπτίζω, to baptize; to immerse, to wash." *Thesaurus Græc.*

79. Mr. WILLIAM YOUNG: "Baptizo; to dip all over, to wash, to baptize." *Latin-English Dictionary.*

80. STOCKIUS: "Βαπτισμα, baptism—Generally, and in virtue of its etymology, it signifies immersion, or dipping into. Particularly and properly, it denotes the immersion or dipping of a thing into water, that it may be cleansed or washed." Jenæ, 1735.

81. STEPHANUS: "Βαπτίζω, to plunge, or immerse—To plunge; that is, to plunge under, or overwhelm in water—To cleanse, to wash." *Thesaurus Græc. Ling.* 1572.

82. SCHWARZIIUS; \* βαπτίζω, to baptize. To plunge, to overwhelm, to dip into\*. To walk, by plunging, Luke xi. 38. Mark vii. 4. Sometimes to sprinkle, to besprinkle, to pour upon†. To purify and

\* To authenticate this, as the native and primary meaning of the term, he produces the following authorities. "POLYB. III. C. 72. Μολὸς ἰσὺς τὰν μάσῃν οἱ περὶ βαπτίζομενοι διαβαῖον, vix transibant pedes ad marginas usque perfr. IDEM, V. C. 47. Αὐτοὶ ὑπ' αὐτῶν βαπτίζομενοι καὶ καταδύνοντες ἐν τοῖς τιλμασί, ipsi a se ipsis mergebantur et deprimebantur in paludibus. DIO, XXXVIII. p. 84. Παντοῦ βαπτίζονται, omnino merguntur. IDEM, XXXVII. extr. p. 64. Χαιμὼν τοιοῦτος ἐξαίρων τὴν χώραν ἀπασὴν κατισχῆν, ὥς---τὰ πλοῖα τὰ ἐν τῇ Τιβεριδί---βαπτίζονται, tanta tempestas subito per totam regionem extitit, ut navigia in Tiberi mergentur. IDEM, L. p. 492. Πῶς μὴ αἰνῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ πλῆθους τῶν κωπῶν βαπτισθῆν; quomodo non ipsa remorum multitudine, submergatur? Adde p. 502, 505. PORPHYRIUS de Styge, p. 282. Ὅταν δὲ κατηγοροῦμενος ἐπιβῇ, ἀναμαρτήτος μὲν ὢν ἀδίας διέρχεται, ἀχρὶ τῶν γονάτων ἔχων τὸ ὕδωρ ἀμαρτῶν δὲ, οὐλοῖτο προβάς βαπτίζεται μέχρι κεφαλῆς. Quum autem accusatus ingreditur lacum, secure, si peccati sit expertus, transit, merfus usque ad genua. Sin peccavit, paulum prociessus submergitur usque ad caput. DIODORUS SICULUS, I. p. 33. Τῶν δὲ χειρῶν θύριαν τὰ πολλὰ μὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ περιληφθῆντα διαφθίρεται βαπτίζομεν, τινὰ δὲ οἱ τοὺς μέτωπους ἐκτενέοντα τοποῦς διασώζονται. Animalium terrestrium multa a flumine Nilo correpta mergendo perduntur: alia in editos locos fugientia servantur. Adde STRABON. VI. p. 421. JOSEPH. Bell. Jud. p. 259. init. Activum quoque in significatione passiva est apud JOSEPH. Antiq. IX. C. x. § 2. Ὅσον εὐπῶ μολλόντος βαπτίζειν τοῦ σκαφους, quum navis mergere-  
tur tantum, quantum nondum ceperat."---I will here add another passage from DIOD. SICULUS, L. I. p. 67. as I find it quoted and translated by Dr SAM. CHANDLER: "Τοὺς δὲ ἰδιώτας διὰ τὴν ἐκ τούτων ὑπορίαν οὐ ΒΑΠΤΙΖΟΤΕΙ ταῖς ἐσφοραῖς. The people were not OPPRESSED with taxes." Defence of Prime Minist. of JOSEPH, Part II. p. 388.

† His only authorities for the two latter of these ideas, are the following: "ÆSCHYL. Prometh. Vinct. p. 53. ἀδικτὸν ἐν σφαλαῖσι θάλασσα ἔειρος, anipiem gladium cædibus tingens. Apud PLATON. in Lysis. p. 5 C. ARISTOPHANES de se dicit, καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἐγὼ εἰμι τῶν λῆθις βιβασσισμῶν. Ftenim ego quoque sum ex his qui heri multum biberunt." Whether these passages do not confirm

and consecrate to God, by plunging. Matt. iii. 6, 11, 13, 14. and elsewhere—*Βαπτισμὸς*, the Baptism, who sustained the singular and sacred office, of plunging men desirous of salvation, that they might know themselves to be devoted to God." *Comment. Crit. et Philolog. Ling. Græc.*—See also MARTINI *Lexicon Philologicum*, sub voce, *Baptismus*. RIISSENII *Summa Theolog.* Loc. xvii. § 26. *Glossarium Vetus*, sub voce *Βαπτισμὸς*. DAMM *Nov. Lex. Græc.* sub voce *Βαπτισμὸς*. Dr. MACKNIGHT's *Harm.* Part II. p. 279. Edit. 2d. PETAVII *Theol. Dogmat.* L. II. *de Penitent.* C. i. § 11. Mr. S. DAVIES's *Sermons*, Vol. II. p. 169. Edit. 3d.

## REFLECTIONS.

REFLECT. I. It will be allowed, I think, by every competent and impartial judge, that many of the authors from whose writings these quotations are made, may be justly numbered among the first literary characters that any age has produced. Now, as all these concessions, declarations, and reasonings, proceeded from persons that practised pouring or sprink-

confirm the idea of *plunging* and *overwhelming*, rather, than that of *sprinkling*, or *pouring*, for which they were produced, let the learned judge. Respecting the latter of them, Dr. DANIEL SCOTT says; "PLATO uses this verb [*βαπτίζω*] of a person who had drank freely, or *drenched* himself in liquor." Note on Matt. xxviii. 19.—So JUSTIN Martyr and CHRYSOSTOM speak of being *baptized in wine*; and CLEMENS Alexandrinus, of being *baptized in sleep*. Apud SUTHERLAND, *Theaur. Ecclæ.* Tom. I. p. 623. And as the word *baptized*, in these connections, expresses the notion of being as it were *buried* in sleep, and *overwhelmed* in wine; so those corresponding adjectives, *ebrius*, *drunk*, and *drunken*, are allusively used to signify *soaked*, *dipped*, *drenched*. Thus MARTIAL: *Lana sanguine conche ebria*. Thus JEHOVAH: *I will make mine arrows DRUNK with blood*, Deut. xxxii. 10. And SHAKESPEARE thus: *Then let the earth be DRUNKEN with our blood*. See AINSWORTH and JOHNSON under the words.



ling in the administration of the ordinance under consideration ; so there is the highest reason to conclude, that nothing but the force of evidence, and a conscientious regard to truth, could have induced them thus to speak : for it is manifest, that such language has the appearance of supporting a contrary practice.

To the foregoing quotations from Pædobaptists, whom candour itself must suppose inclined to make as few concessions to the Baptists, as the evidence of stubborn facts would permit ; we will add the attestations of others, that may be justly considered as impartial spectators of our controversy about the right manner of administering baptism. The authors to whom I advert, belong to the denomination of people called Quakers ; and their language is as follows.

1. ROBERT BARCLAY : "*Βαπτίζω* signifies *immergo* ; that is, to plunge and dip in ; and that was the proper use of water baptism among the Jews, and also by John and the primitive Christians, who used it. Whereas our adversaries, for the most part, only *sprinkle* a little water upon the forehead, which doth not at all answer to the word *baptism*—So that if our adversaries will stick to the word, they must alter their method of sprinkling." *Apology*, Proposition xii. § 10.

2. JOHN GRATTON : "John did baptize into water ; and it was a baptism, a real dipping, or plunging into water, and so a real baptism was John's." *Life of John Gratton*, p. 231.

3. WILLIAM DELL : Speaking of baptism, he calls it, "The *plunging* of a man in cold water." *Select Works*, p. 389. Edit. 1773.

4. THOMAS ELLWOOD : "They [the Apostles, at the feast of Pentecost] were now baptized with the Holy

Holy Ghost indeed; and that in the strict and proper sense of the word *baptize*; which signifies to dip, plunge, or put under." *Sacred Hist. of the N. Test.* Part II. p. 307.

5. SAMUEL FOTHERGILL: "By which [baptism of the Holy Spirit,] I understand such a thorough immersion into his holy nature, as to know him, the only begotten Son of God, to conform the soul to his own image." *Remarks on Address to People called Quakers*, p. 27.

6. JOSEPH PHIPPS: The baptism of the Holy Spirit is "effected by spiritual immersion—The practice of sprinkling infants, under the name of baptism, hath neither precept nor precedent in the New Testament. *Dissertations on Bap. and Communion*, p. 25, 30.

7. WILLIAM PENN: "I cannot see why the Bishop [of Cork, in answer to whom he wrote] should assume the power of unchristianizing us, for not practising of that which he himself practises so unscripturally, and that according to the sentiments of a considerable part of Christendom; having not one text of Scripture to prove that sprinkling in the face was the water baptism,—in the first times—Then it was in the river Jordan; now in a basin." *Defence of Gospel Truths, against the Bishop of Cork*, p. 82, 83.

8. GEORGE WHITEHEAD: "Sprinkling infants, I deny to be baptism, either in a proper or Scripture sense. For sprinkling is *rhantism*, and not *baptism*; coming of βαπτίζω, i. e. *aspergo*, to sprinkle, or to besprinkle, Heb. ix. 13, 19. compared with Heb. x. 22. βαντισμός, a besprinkling; and Chap. xii. 24. and 1 Pet. i. 2. But βαπτίζω, is to baptize, to plunge under water, to overwhelm. Wherefore I would not have these men offended at the word *rhantism*, it being as much English as the word baptism. And also βα-

τισμός

*rhantize* is translated *washing*, i. e. of cups, pots, brazen vessels, and tables, Mark vii. 4. Now if washing here should be taken in the common sense, cleanly people use not to do it only by sprinkling some drops of water upon them, but by washing them clean; so that rhantism can be neither *baptism*, nor *washing*, in a true or proper sense." *Truth Prevailing*, Chap. ix. p. 116.

9. ELIZABETH BATHURST: "Sprinkling infants, this they [the Quakers] utterly deny, as a thing by men imposed, and never by God or Christ instituted." *Life and Writings of Elizabeth Bathurst*, Chap. v. p. 44.

10. THOMAS LAWSON: "Such as *rhantize*, or sprinkle infants, have no command from Christ, nor example among the Apostles, nor the first primitive Christians, for so doing—The ceremony of John's ministration, according to divine institution, was by dipping, plunging, or overwhelming their bodies in water; as SCAPULA and STEPHENS, two great masters in the Greek tongue, testify; as also GROTIUS, PASOR, VOSSIUS, MINCEUS, LEIGH, CASAU-BON, BUCER, BULLINGER, ZANCHY, SPANHEMIUS, RÜGERS, TAYLOR, HAMMOND, CALVIN, PISCATOR, AQUINAS, SCOTUS—As for *sprinkling*, the Greeks call it *rhantismos*, which I render *rhantism*: for 'tis as proper to call sprinkling *rhantism*, as to call dipping *baptism*. This linguist cannot be ignorant of, that dipping and sprinkling are expressed by several words, both in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew. 'Tis very evident, if *sprinkling* had been of divine institution, the Greeks had their *rhantismos*; but as *dipping* was the institution, they used *baptismos*; so maintained the purity and propriety of the language. —To sprinkle young or old, and call it baptism, is very

very incongruous; yet, as improper as to call a horse a cow: for baptism signifies dipping. However, rhanthism hath entered into, and among, the professors of Christianity; and, TO GAIN THE MORE ACCEPTANCE, 'tis called baptism." *Baptismalogia*, p. 117, 118, 119.

11. ANTHONY PURVER: "*Baptized* is but a Greek word used in English, and signifying plunged." *Note*, on 1 Cor. xv. 29.—Such is the harmonious and united testimony of these our impartial Friends: nor do I suppose that any sensible person of the same denomination would for a moment scruple to subscribe the preceding declarations.

REFLECT. II. By the numerous quotations here produced from the most learned Pædobaptists we are expressly taught, That immersion is the radical and obvious meaning of the term baptism. No. 1—82—That the Danes, the Swedes, the Germans, and the Dutch, render the word βαπτίζω by expressions that signify to dip. No. 12—That it has no other signification in Mark vii. 4. No. 10, 40, 50, 82—That the idea of immersion is retained when the term is used metaphorically of the Holy Spirit, No. 3, 8, 51, 53; of sufferings, No. 6, 8, 23, 58, 60, 70, and of other things, No. 42, 64, 82—That βαπτίζειν is of a middle signification, between επιπολάζειν, *to swim on the surface*, and δυνειν, *to go down to the bottom*. No. 1, 10, 27, 43, 45, 64—That the word baptism is nowhere used in Scripture to signify sprinkling. No. 40—That it signifies immersion only; not washing, except by consequence. No. 65—That the Greeks wanted not other words to have expressed a different action, if the institution would have borne it. No. 49—That the manner of baptizing should correspond to the signification of the ordinance. No. 30—That all anti-

quity

and Scripture confirm the idea of plunging. No. 49—That sprinkling is *rhantism*, rather than baptism. No. 2, 59—That new customs introduce new significations of words. No. 67—That our opponents chiefly avail themselves of inferences, of analogy, and of doubtful construction. No. 42—And that the Baptists have the advantage in point of argument. No. 42, 63.

Let us now review the testimonies of our impartial Friends, the Quakers. They assert, That the word in question signifies immersion. No. 1—11—That the first administrator practised accordingly. No. 2, 7, 10—That if sprinkling had been the institution, the Greeks had their *rhantismos*; but dipping being appointed, *baptismos* was used in divine law. No. 10—That sprinkling is neither baptism, nor washing. No. 8—That there is neither precept nor precedent for sprinkling. No. 6, 7, 10—That the contrast between baptism and the rite which is now practised, is like that between the waves of Jordan, and the water in a portable basin. No. 7—That sprinkling of infants is a human invention. No. 9, 10—And that sprinkling is called baptism, to keep it in countenance. No. 10.—Such is the import of what the most learned Pædobaptists assert, and of what the impartial Quakers affirm, concerning the term in dispute; which, whether it be in our favour, I leave the Reader to judge.

REFLECT. III. WERENFELSIUS has well observed, in his excellent Dissertation *De Scopo Interpretis*, that ‘ some interpreters do not search the Scripture so much for the meaning of the Holy Spirit, as for praise and honour; others, not so much for the sense of Scripture, as for their own opinion; and others, not so much for the true meaning of Scripture,

**Scripture, as far as that is useful or agreeable\*.**

Now as our enquiry here is concerning the sense of a term, an important enacting term of divine law; and as the partiality and pride, so justly condemned by WERENFELSIUS, are too common to all theological writers; to avoid the appearance of predilection for a particular sense of the word in dispute, we will have recourse to the observations and rules of our opposers themselves, respecting the true meaning of inspired Writers, and the expounding of laws. The following extracts may perhaps be useful to direct us in the present case, and are therefore submitted to the Reader's consideration.

First, then, BUDDEUS: 'It is necessary, doubtless, that he who desires to be understood when he writes or speaks, should intend to convey only *one* meaning; which, if we obtain, we have the true and genuine sense†.' CHAMIER: 'There is but one genuine sense of a text‡.' Dr. OWEN: 'If it [the Scripture] have not every-where one proper determinate sense, it hath none at all§.' SCHELHORNIUS: 'The true sense of Scripture, is not every sense the words will bear||.' WERENFELSIUS: 'The true meaning of Scripture, is not every sense the words will bear, and perhaps may excite in the reader's mind; nor yet every sense that is true in itself; but that which was really intended by the holy writer¶.' ANONYMOUS: 'Laws being directed to the unlearned, as well as the learned, ought to be construed in their *most obvious* meaning, and not explained away by subtle distinctions; and no law

\* *Opuscula Theolog.* p. 373, 374. † *Theolog. Dogmat.* L. I. C. ii. § 24. ‡ *Panßrat.* Tom. I. L. XIV. C. x. § 18. § *On Heb.* iii. 15. Vol. II. p. 155. || *Bib. Bremens.* Class. vi. p. 468. ¶ *Opuscula*, p. 372.

the proper sense of the words is as commodious, and equally fitted to the subject of the statute\*.'—Dr.

SHERLOCK: 'When the words of the law are capable of different senses, and reason is for one sense, and the other sense against reason, there it is fit that a plain and necessary reason should expound the law. But when the law is not capable of such different senses, or there is no such reason as makes one sense absurd, and the other necessary; the law must be expounded according to the *most plain* and *obvious* signification of the words, though it should condemn that which we think there may be some reason for, or at least no reason against; for otherwise it is an easy matter to expound away all the laws of God†.'—Bp. TAYLOR: 'In all things where

the precept is given in the proper stile of laws,—he that takes the *first* sense is the likeliest to be well guided—In the interpretation of the laws of Christ, the *strict* sense is to be followed‡.'—Dr. JONATH. EDWARDS: 'In words which are capable of two

senses, the natural and proper is the primary; and therefore ought, in the first place and chiefly, to be regarded§.'—Dr. HORSLEY: 'It is a principle

with me, that the true sense of any phrase in the New Testament, is what may be called its standing sense: that which will be the *first* to occur to common people, of every country and in every age||.'—

VITRINGA: 'This is accounted by all a constant and undoubted rule of approved interpretation; That the *ordinary* and *most usual* signification of

\* *Encycloped. Britan.* Vol. VI. Article, LAW, p. 11. † *Preserv. against Pop.* Vol. II. Appendix, p. 11. ‡ *Ducl. Dub.* B. I. Chap. i. p. 26. B. II. Chap. iii. p. 328. § *Preserv. against Socinianism*, Part III. p. 52. || *Reply to Dr. Priestley*, Lett. iv. p. 23.

' words must not be distorted, except for sufficient reasons\*.'—Dr. WATERLAND: ' Since words are  
 ' designed to convey some meaning, if we take the  
 ' liberty of playing upon words after the meaning is  
 ' fixed and certain, there can be no security against  
 ' equivocation and wile, in any laws,—or any en-  
 ' gagements whatever. All the ends and uses of  
 ' speech will hereby be perverted†.'—Dr. WIL-  
 LIAM SHERLOCK: ' In expounding Scripture, we  
 ' must confine ourselves to the *plain* and *natural* sig-  
 ' nification of the words—They [the Socinians] take  
 ' and challenge to themselves a liberty of putting any  
 ' sense upon the words of Scripture which they can  
 ' possibly bear, or are ever used in—If we believe  
 ' nothing but what the Scripture does plainly and ex-  
 ' pressly teach, according to the most proper and  
 ' usual acceptation of the words; if we believe amiss,  
 ' it is none of our fault, unless just reverence to Scrip-  
 ' ture be a fault——It is impossible to prove, that *that*  
 ' is not the sense of Scripture, which is the *natural* in-  
 ' terpretation of the words of any one text, and is not  
 ' contradicted by any other text—Can they [the Socini-  
 ' ans] prove, that the words do *not* signify what we say  
 ' they do? Or, that this is not the *most easy* and *obvi-*  
 ' *ous* sense of the words, and what every man would  
 ' take to be the natural signification of them, who did  
 ' not think himself concerned to try his skill to force  
 ' some other sense on them? When the words are  
 ' plain, and the sense plain and obvious, nothing can  
 ' tempt any man to reject the plain sense of the words,  
 ' for some obscure, laboured, and artificial interpreta-  
 ' tions, but a dislike of the doctrine which the plain

\* *De Synag. Vet. L. I. Pars I. C. iii. p. 110.*  
*Case of Arian Subscrip. p. 9, 10.*

† *Supplem. to*



and obvious sense of the words teaches\*.'—Dr. DODDRIDGE: 'I am more and more convinced, that the vulgar sense of the New Testament, that is, the sense in which an honest man of plain sense would take it, on his *first* reading the original, or any good translation, is almost every where the true general sense of any passage—I chose to follow the plainest and most obvious and common interpretation; which, indeed, I generally think the best—As it is certain that *αρχη* has not always that signification, [for which some contend] I judge it safe to give what is more commonly the sense of it†.'—Once more: Mr. ALSOP says, 'No cogent reason can be assigned, why we should depart from the plain, ordinary, primary acceptation of the word *Christ*, for a figurative, improper and *secondary* acceptation‡.'—Were I to produce all the passages of this kind, from learned Pædobaptists, with which observation has furnished me, I should fill several more pages§: but I forbear, considering these as quite sufficient.

The leading idea of the foregoing paragraph is not a merely speculative principle: it is considered and treated, by great numbers of learned Pædobaptists, as of the highest importance. In all controversies, where an appeal is made to Divine Revelation, every one is ready to avail himself, as much as possible, of the primary, obvious, and most common sense of inspired language, both as to single terms and complete

\* *Scripture Proofs of our Saviour's Div.* p. 64, 65, 130, 131, 132.  
 † *Fam. Exp. Note*, on Matt. xviii. 17. 2 Cor. viii. 1. Rev. iii. 14.  
 ‡ *Antifozzo*, p. 35. § See, among others, Dr. OWEN, *On the Nature of a Gosp. Church*, p. 142. IKENII *Dissertat. Philolog. Theolog.* p. 69, 361. JOS. PLACÆI *Opera*, Tom. II. p. 91, 255, 777, 875. FRANCOF. 1703. LUTHER, *De Servo Arbitrio*, p. 115, 184. Aigent. 1707.

propositions. A sensible disputant is never willing to wave this advantage; nor, so far as I have observed, will he deliberately violate this principle, except when maintaining such hypotheses as he knows would be injured, if not subverted by it. Of the *latter*, Socinians are extremely culpable: and, indeed, we need not wonder at it. For the very life of their cause consists in explaining some of the most capital terms of Scripture, in an improper and a secondary, a far-fetched and an arbitrary sense. They make exceptions to the clearest evidence of Scripture testimony; insisting, that this or the other emphatical term, on which the argument very much depends, *may* be understood in a sense extremely different from its natural and obvious meaning: and then, without any reason besides the support of their own hypothesis, they argue and infer any thing that suits their purpose. Thus deserting at every turn the radical and common acceptation of the most important scriptural expressions, they are never at a loss for an evasion. Against this conduct their numerous opponents have made very loud complaints; of which I will produce a few examples. 'Their whole design and endeavour,' says Dr. OWEN, 'is to put in exceptions against the *obvious* sense and interpretation of the words; not fixing on any determinate exposition of [the passage in question] themselves, such as they will abide by, in opposition unto any other sense of the place. Now this is a most *sophistical* way of arguing upon testimonies, and suited to make controversies endless. Whose wit is so barren, as not to be able to raise one exception or other, against the plainest and most evident testimony? So the Socinians deal with us, in all the testimonies we produce to prove the Deity and satisfaction of Christ. They suppose it enough

‘to evade their force, if they can but pretend that the words are capable of *another* sense; although they will not abide by it, that *this* or *that* is their sense: for if they would do so, when that is overthrown, the truth would be established. But every testimony of the Scripture hath *one determinate* sense. When this is contended about, it is equal those at difference do express their apprehensions of the mind of the Holy Spirit, in the word which they will abide by. When this is done, let it be examined and tried, whether of the two senses pretended unto, doth best comply with the signification and use of the words, the context or scope of the place, other Scripture testimonies, and the analogy of faith—The words *may* have another sense; therefore [say the Socinians] nothing from them can be concluded; whereby they have left nothing stable, or unshaken in Christian religion—How will they prove that [*ΕΞ ΕΥΕΤΟ*] *may* be rendered by *suit, was*? They tell you, it is so in two other places in the New Testament. But doth that prove that it *may* so much as be so rendered here? The proper sense and common usage of it is, *was made*; and because it is once or twice used in a peculiar sense, *may* it be so rendered here [John i. 14.] where nothing requires that it be turned aside from its most usual acceptation?—The various signification of a word, used *absolutely* in any other place, is sufficient for these men to confute its *necessury* signification in any context\*.’—Dr. JOHN EDWARDS: ‘Certainly, never men made such ill use of Grammar and Criticism as these [Socinians] do;

\* *Nature of a Gospel Church*, p. 144. *Mystery of the Gospel vindicated*, p. 167, 218. See also p. 228, 275, 303. *Expofit. of Heb.* Vol. III. p. 468.

‘ for they make use of them only to deprave the true sense of the holy writ. To avoid and put by the force of some plain and express places, how do they slyly, how do they tug! To lexicons, dictionaries, and glossaries they resort, and enquire into and pick up all possible senses of the words and phrases which they meet with in Scripture, but what are most agreeable to the matter and scope of the places they are concerned in. If a word have any other meaning in any author whatsoever, they make this a sufficient warrant to depart from the true and genuine sense of the place\*.’—VOLKELIUS having asserted that, by the term *Godhead*, Col. 2. 8. ‘ neither the nature of God, nor of Christ, but the knowledge of the divine will, and the manner of worshipping God, *may* be, and therefore *must* be understood;’ Mr. ALSOP replies, ‘ The reader is now satisfied why it *must* be so. It *may* be so, and therefore necessarily it *must* be so:’ and, in a similar case, he says; ‘ From *may* be in the premises, to *must* be in the conclusion, is a high leap†.’—Once more: Dr. HORSLEY says, ‘ It is the particular happiness of the Unitarian writers, that they are never found at a loss for an expedient‡.’

Further: When Protestant Pædobaptists are disputing with Roman Catholics about the meaning of that capital term *justification*, they constantly maintain the necessity of abiding by its primary, obvious, and most common acceptation, which is forensic; in opposition to any real or pretended secondary sense, for which the Papists earnestly plead. Of this I will give the following instances. TURRETTINUS:

\* *Discourse concerning Truth and Error*, p. 301. † *Antisozzo*, p. 37.  
‡ *Reply to Dr. PRIESTLEY*, Lett. v. p. 30.

Properly the verb *justify*, is forensic ; and signifies,  
 to absolve any one in judgment ; or to account and  
 declare just—The Roman Catholics do not deny,  
 that the word *justification*, and the verb *justify*, are  
 frequently used in a forensic sense ;—yet they will  
 not allow this to be the constant sense of the terms,  
 but maintain, that they often signify the real pro-  
 duction, acquisition, and increase of righteousness :  
 and that this acceptance of the words takes place in  
 a particular manner, with reference to the justifica-  
 tion of man before God—But though the word  
 justification, in some passages of Scripture, depart  
 from its proper signification, and take a sense  
 that is not forensic ; it does not follow that we do  
 ill by taking it in a judicial sense, because its proper  
 sense is to be regarded in those places which are  
 the seat of the doctrine \*.—BUDDEUS : ‘ It may  
 be demonstrated, that the forensic sense of the word  
 justification, is the constant and perpetual significa-  
 tion of it in holy Scripture. Yet were it very clear-  
 ly shown, that in one or two places the word is  
 used in a different sense, our cause would not  
 be injured : for it would still be a fact, that the  
 forensic sense, is more usual, and chiefly perspicuous  
 in the sacred writings†.—Dr. OWEN, when en-  
 deavouring to vindicate the forensic sense of the word  
*justify*, against the exceptions of a learned man, makes  
 the following preliminary observation. ‘ I shall pre-  
 mise that which I judge not an unreasonable de-  
 mand ; namely, That if the signification of the word  
 in any, or all the places which he mentions, should  
 seem doubtful unto any, (as it doth not unto me)

\* *Institut.* Loc. XVI. Quæst. i. § 4, 5. 9.    † *Theolog. Dogmat.*  
 L. IV. C. v. § 11. p. 953.

‘ that

that the uncertainty of a very few places should not make us question the proper signification of a word whose sense is determined in so many, wherein it is clear and unquestionable\*.

Once more: Our learned Pædobaptist Brethren apply the same principle to the interpretation of Greek particles. Thus Dr. DODDRIDGE: 'It seems desirable, where it can be done, to interpret the *particles* in their *most usual sense*†.'—Mr. JAMES HERVEY, when disputing the signification of a Greek particle with Mr. J. WESLEY, says; 'I am ready to grant, that places may be found where the preposition *en* must be understood according to your sense. But then every one knows that this is not the native, obvious, literal meaning; rather a meaning swayed, influenced, moulded by the preceding or following word—He will not allow the Greek preposition *en* to signify *in*; though I can prove it to have been in peaceable possession of this signification for more than two thousand years‡.'

REFLECT. IV. If we examine the present prevailing practice of pouring, or sprinkling, upon those principles, rules, and reasonings, which the most eminent Pædobaptists have laid before us in the preceding quotations; or if we pay any regard to the decision of those who have no interest in this dispute, and may therefore be justly considered as quite impartial; we must conclude, that neither sprinkling, nor pouring, is warranted by the word *baptism*. For our learned opponents themselves assure us, without so much as one exception occurring to observation in the course of my reading;

\* *Dott. of Justif.* Chap. iv. Vid. GOMARI *Opera*, Pars II. p. 92. WALAI *Enchirid. Relig.* p. 337. 338. MASTRICHT. *Theolog.* I. VI. C. vi. § 19. WITSII *Oecon. Fæd.* I. III. C. viii. § 5---14. † *Note*, on Mark ix. 49. ‡ *Letters to Mr. J. WESLEY*, Lett. i. p. 26. Lett. x. p. 232.

That the primary meaning of the term in dispute, is *immersion*; and many distinguished characters among them unite in directing us, to interpret words and laws agreeably to the primary, obvious, and most usual sense of the terms. Now Pædobaptism, as practised in these Northern parts of Europe, is not agreeable to the native, obvious, and common acceptation of the word *baptism*—It adopts a supposed secondary, remote, and obscure sense of the term—It represents our divine Legislator as having more meanings than one, under the same enacting term, of the same law, and at the same time; for, so far as I have observed, none deny that *immersion* is warranted by that commanding word—It confronts an established principle upon which, among other things, the great doctrine of justification is defended against the Papists—a principle on which every confutation of Socinian error must proceed—And it opposes the grand rule of all interpretation; *That the ordinary and most usual signification of words must not be deserted, except for cogent reasons*: which rule is no other than the language of reason, of observation, and of common sense. Pædobaptism, however, has nothing to plead for departing from this rule but—*its own existence*.

REFLECT. V. Dr. ADDINGTON has justly observed, that ‘if there are two translations of a word, one of which is certainly true, and the other may be false, it is easy to say which the wise and candid would prefer\*.’ Now, on the authorities here produced—authorities of commentators, of critics, and of lexicographers the most respectable—we may venture to assert, that the word baptism *certainly* signifies immersion, whatever meaning it may have besides; consequently, both candour and prudence require us to em-

\* *Christian Minister's Reas.* p. 34.

that acceptance in preference to any other. —But supposing, without granting, that the word under consideration is occasionally used by inspired Writers, by the Septuagint translators, or by Greek classics, to signify *washing*, where there is no immersion, or even to denote *sprinkling*; yet while it is allowed by so many of the first characters for sacred criticism, that its primary and obvious meaning is immersion; there is no reason to depart from it in the administration of a divine ordinance; except it can be proved, that the design of the institution will not comport with it, or that the practice of the Apostles was a departure from it: concerning both which, we shall hear the verdict of learned men in subsequent Chapters. —Nay, if the numerous authors produced be not under a gross mistake, in fixing the natural and primary meaning of the term *baptism*; though many incontestible instances could be brought, that βαπτίζω, in certain connections, signifies *to wash*, without including the idea of dipping, and that on some occasions it also signifies *to pour*, and *to sprinkle*; yet immersion would still be the grand ruling idea. Surely, then, we ought not hastily, or for trivial reasons, to desert the original, the natural and proper sense of a term, which was chosen by the unerring Spirit, when a new branch of holy worship was appointed; especially seeing that very term was intended to direct the church in all future ages, *how* the worship should be performed.

It should be well observed, that when our Lord after his resurrection says, *Go—baptize*; he does not mention baptism by way of allusion, or incidentally. No, he speaks the language of *legislation*: he delivers DIVINE LAW. He mentions and appoints baptism as an ordinance of God, and as a branch of



human duty. Where then must we expect precision in the use of terms, if not on such an occasion? Can it be supposed, without impeaching the wisdom or the goodness of Christ, that he enacted a law relating to his own worship, the *principal* term in which is obscure and ambiguous? Can it be imagined that he *intended* an ambiguity so great in the term baptism, which prescribes the duty to be performed, as equally to warrant the use of immersion, of pouring, or of sprinkling, which are three different actions? We may safely challenge our opposers to produce an instance of this kind out of the Mosaic ritual.—Does Jehovah, when giving his positive laws, make use of a term that properly signifies *dipping*? He means as he speaks, and requires immersion, in contradistinction to pouring and sprinkling. Does he, on the other hand, employ a word which, properly understood, signifies *pouring*? Or does he choose an expression, the radical idea of which is no other than *sprinkling*? He still means as he speaks, and enjoins what he mentions, in distinction from every other action.

That dipping, pouring, and sprinkling, denote three different actions; in the language of divine law, as well as in the estimate of common sense, we have many examples in the writings of Moses. The following are selected for the reader's notice. *And the priest shall dip, βαψει, (SEPTUAG.) his finger in the blood, and SPRINKLE, ποσπαρει, of the blood seven times before the Lord, before the veil of the sanctuary. And the priest shall—POUR, εκχεει, all the blood of the bullock at the bottom of the altar\*. Moses took the anointing oil—and he SPRINKLED, εψπαρευ,*

\* Levit. iv. 6, 7. See Verse 17, 18.

## CHAP. II.]

## *Baptize, and Baptism*

thereof upon the altar seven times,—and he **POURED**, *επεχρεε*, of the anointing oil upon Aaron's head. Moses **SPRINKLED**, *προσεχεε*, the blood upon the altar round about—and he **WASHED**, *επλουεν*, the inwards and the legs in water\*. He **DIPT**, *εβαψε*, his finger in the blood—and poured out, *εξεχεεν*, the blood at the bottom of the altar—And Aaron's sons presented unto him the blood, which he **SPRINKLED**, *προσεχεεν*, round about upon the altar—And he did **WASH**, *επλουε*, the inwards†, As for the living bird, he shall take it, and the cedar wood, and the scarlet, and the hyssop, and shall **DIP** them, *εβαψε αυλα*, and the living bird, in the blood of the bird that was killed—And he shall **SPRINKLE**, *περιρρανει*, upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy seven times—And he that is to be cleansed shall **WASH**, *πλουει*, his clothes, and shave off all his hair, and **WASH HIMSELF**, *λουσεται*, in water, that he may be clean‡. And whosoever toucheth his bed shall **WASH**, *πλουει*, his clothes, and **BATHE HIMSELF**, *λουσεται*, in water. See the following verse §.—So in the New Testament, washing the feet is distinguished from bathing the whole body, washing a part of the body from being baptized, and baptism from washing; as appears by the following instances. He that is **WASHED** (or has been bathing, *ο λελουμενος*) needeth not, save, to **WASH HIS FEET**, *ποδας νιψασθαι*. He took them the same hour of the night and **WASHED**, *ελουσεν*, their stripes; and was **BAPTIZED**, *εβαπτισθη*, he and all his straightway. Arise and be **BAPTIZED**, *βαπτισαι*, and **WASH AWAY**, *απολουσαι*, thy sins||. By which it appears, that as *tasting*, in the language of Scripture, is distinguished from *drinking*¶; so are *washing* the feet, from

\* Lev. viii. 17, 18, 19, 21. † Chap. ix. 9, 12, 14. ‡ Chap. xiv. 6, 7, 8. § Lev. xv. 5, 6.—See also, Numb. xix. 4, 7, 18, 19. Deut. xxi. 6, 7. || Joh. xiii. 10. See Dr. Doddridge in loc. Acta xvi. 33. and xxii. 16. ¶ Matt. xxvii. 34.

*bathing* the whole body, and *washing* a *part* of the *body*, from being *baptized*. So that ancient patron of Pædobaptism, CYPRIAN, expressly distinguishes between *washing* and *sprinkling*, when professedly pleading for the latter, in what he thought a case of necessity. In his letter to MAGNUS he intimates that some doubted, whether those who received the clinical baptism 'were to be accounted legitimate Christians; eo quod aquâ salutari non loti sint, sed perfusi, because 'they were not *washed*, but *sprinkled*, with the salutary water\*.' Whence it appears, that in CYPRIAN's time sprinkling was quite a novel practice; that it was used only in favour of those who were confined by illness; and that baptismal *washing*, in the language of CYPRIAN, is no other than plunging.—Mr. CLEAVELAND also has very lately distinguished between dipping, sprinkling, and washing, in the following manner: 'We *dip* our hand in water, though 'not all over, to baptize a person by *sprinkling*, or 'to *wash* our face †.' With what reason or shadow of propriety, then, can any one pretend that the term baptism is equally expressive of these different actions?

Were the leading term in any human law to have an ambiguity in it equal to that for which our Brethren plead, with regard to the word *baptism*; such law would certainly be considered as betraying either the weakness or wickedness of the legislator; and be condemned as opening a door to perpetual chicane and painful uncertainty. Far be it, then, from us to suppose, that our gracious and omniscient Lord should give a law relating to divine worship, and obligatory on the most illiterate of his real disciples, which may be fairly construed to mean, *this*, *that*, or

\* Epist. lxxvi. † *Infar. Bap. from Heaven*, p. 63. Salem, 1784.

the other action—a law, which is calculated to excite and perpetuate contention among his wisest and sincerest followers—a law, in respect of its triple meaning, that would disgrace a British Parliament, as being involved in the dark ambiguity of a Pagan oracle.—It must, therefore, be at our peril; if we indulge a wanton fancy in the interpretation of that law which is now before us. For, as Mr. CHARNOCK observes, 'Tis a part of God's sovereignty to be the interpreter, as well as the maker, of his own laws; as it is a right inherent in the legislative power among men: So that it is an invasion of his right to fasten a sense upon his declared will, which doth not naturally flow from the words. For to put any interpretation according to our pleasure upon divine as well as human laws, contrary to their true intent, is a virtual usurpation of this power; because if laws may be interpreted according to our humours, the power of the law would be more in the interpreter than in the legislator\*.'

Were the same licence of interpretation used in construing the law of the sacred supper, numbers practise on the term baptism; we should probably soon behold an obsolete and superstitious custom revived: the custom, I mean, of employing a reed, a glass tube, or something similar, by which to suck the wine out of the cup†. When our Lord instituted the holy supper, his order concerning the wine was; ΠΙΝΕΤΕ ΕΞ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΠΑΝΤΕΣ, DRINK ye all of it, Matt. xxvi. 27. Now none will dispute, that ΠΙΝΕΤΕ is from ΠΙΝΩ; or that the natural and proper signification of it is, to drink—in the full and most proper sense, to DRINK. Nay, it will be allowed, I sup-

\* Of Man's Enmity to God, p. 98. † HOSPINIANI Hist. Sac. L. IV. c. ii, p. 248. VENEM. Hist. Eccles. Tom. VI. p. 193.

pose, that if *πινω* does not signify that precise idea, there is never a word in the Greek Testament that can express it. Yet the learned lexicographer SCHWARZIUS tells us, that it signifies not only to *drink*; but also to *SUCK*, to *imbibe*, to *admit*, to *receive*, for which he refers to Heb. vi. 7.

Our Brethren ought not to forget, that the principal terms of a law, and especially of a law relating to divine worship, should be understood in their natural, obvious, primary sense; from which it is dangerous to depart, except some glaring absurdity would follow. This remark is perfectly agreeable to the doctrine of Sir WILLIAM BLACKSTONE, who lays it down as a rule of legal interpretation; That the words of a law 'are generally to be understood in their *usual* and *most known* signification; not so much regarding the propriety of grammar, as their general and popular use:—but, 'where words bear either none, or a very absurd signification, if literally understood, we must a little deviate from the received sense of them\*.' This, we may venture to say, is a rule of good sense, as well as of legal knowledge; and should be constantly regarded in our interpretation of laws, whether divine or human. 'Whereas, if we wantonly depart from it, almost any hypothesis may be supported; for by taking such a liberty, there is no word in any language that might not have the whole of its natural and primary sense expounded away.

REFLECT. VI. While our Brethren maintain that the term baptism, when relating to the institution so called, means any thing short of immersion; it behoves them to inform us, which of our English words is competent to express its adequate idea. I have ob-

\* *Commentaries*, Vol. I. Introduct. Sect. ii.

served, indeed, that they seldom fix upon any particular term and abide by it, as answering to the word baptism; but rather choose to use, *washing, pouring, or sprinkling*, just as their cause requires. Now, as those three expressions, in their native signification, denote three different actions; it looks as if they were fearful of being embarrassed, were they to select one of them, and uniformly to employ it, in preference to the other two. As they do not pretend our divine Lawgiver meant, that washing, pouring, and sprinkling, should *all* be performed on the same person to constitute baptism; so, while they believe that any action short of immersion is warranted by his command, they ought as fair disputants to tell us what that action is, and by what name we should call it. See the quotations from Dr. OWEN, REFLECT. III. p. 75, 76. At present, however, we can only ask, Is it *washing*? If so, we may consider that word as a proper translation of it\*, and a complete substitute for it, wherever the ordinance before us is mentioned by the sacred writers†. Let us make the experiment on a few passages. We will take, for instance, the words of Ananias to Saul, Acts xxii. 16. which must be read thus; *Arise and be WASHED, and WASH away thy sins*: and those of Paul, Rom. vi. 3. and Gal. iii. 27. *Know ye not, that so many of us as were WASHED into Jesus Christ, were WASHED into his death? As many of us as have been WASHED into Christ, have put on Christ.*—Is it *pouring*? Then we must read Mark i. 9. and

\* *Baptism* is the Greek word, with an English termination; concerning which Mr. LEWIS says, 'Our last translators were directed by the King to retain the old ecclesiastical words,' of which baptism was one. *Hist. of Eng. Translations*, p. 317, 326. Edit. 2d.

† It is an old rule, *Definitiones debent cum definito reciprocari*; that is, *A definition, and the thing defined, should be convertible.*

Acts ii. 38, 41. thus ; *Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was POURED of John in (eis, into) Jordan—Repent and be POURED every one of you—Then they that gladly received his word, were POURED.—Is it sprinkling ?* Then we must read, John iii. 23. Rom. vi. 4. Col. ii. 12. thus ; *John also was SPRINKLING in Enon near to Salim, BECAUSE THERE WAS MUCH WATER there : and they came and were SPRINKLED. Therefore we are BURIED with him by SPRINKLING into death—BURIED with him by SPRINKLING.* These few examples may suffice to show, what an awkward appearance the noble sense and masculine diction of inspiration wear, when expressed according to this hypothesis. Whereas, if instead of *washing, pouring, or sprinkling*, you employ the word *immersion* ; the preceding passages will make a very different figure, and read thus : *Arise and be IMMERSED, and wash away thy sins—Know ye not, that so many of us as were IMMERSED into Jesus Christ, were IMMERSED into his death ?—As many of us as have been IMMERSED into Christ, have put on Christ—Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was IMMERSED of John in (or into) Jordan—Repent and be IMMERSED every one of you—Then they that gladly received his word, were IMMERSED—John also was IMMERSING in Enon near to Salim, because there was MUCH WATER there : and they came and were IMMERSED—Therefore we are buried with him by IMMERSION into death—Buried with him by IMMERSION.* Here we have, if I mistake not, both dignity of sentiment, and propriety of language. Hence it appears, that the word βαπτίζω is connected with such particles (εν and εις) as forbid our concluding that either *wash, pour, or sprinkle*, is a proper substitute for it. The form of expression adopted by Evangelists and Apostles, is always, if I mistake not, baptizing

baptizing *in* or *into* something. Thus, for example, *ev* or *eis*, *in*, or *into* Jordan\* ; *ev*, *in* water, *in* the Holy Spirit † ; *eis*, *into* the name ‡, *into* Moses §, *into* Christ ||, *into* his death ¶. *Eis*, in the case of baptism, cannot be rendered *to* or *towards*; because it would be absurd to say, that John baptized *to* or *towards* Jordan; nor in regard to this affair can *ev* be translated *with* or *by*; because it would be awkward to say, John baptized *with* or *by* Jordan; besides, *eis*, which is used of the same administration, cannot be so rendered. Baptism, therefore, being always expressed as performed *in*, or *into* something, must be immersion, and not pouring or sprinkling; for *persons* cannot be sprinkled or poured *into* water, though they may be plunged *into* it.

Let us now apply the same terms to the different *metaphorical* baptisms of which we read in the New Testament. There we have, the baptism of *sufferings*, of the *Spirit* and of *fire*, of the *cloud* and the *sea*. According to our Brethren, the passages to which I refer must be read, either thus: *I have a WASHING to be WASHED WITH, and how am I straitned till it be accomplished!—He shall WASH you with* (rather *in*; *ev*) *the Holy Spirit and in fire—And were all WASHED unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea\*\**. Or thus: *I have a POURING to be POURED with, and how am I straitned till it be accomplished!—He shall POUR you in the Holy Spirit and in fire—And were all POURED unto Moses, in the cloud and in the sea.—Or thus: I have a SPRINKLING to be SPRINKLED with, and how am I straitned till it be accomplished!—He shall SPRINKLE you in the Holy Spirit and in fire—And were all SPRINK-*

\* Matt. iii. 6. Mark i. 9. † Matt. iii. 11. ‡ Matt. xxviii. 19. § 1 Cor. x. 2. || Gal. iii. 27. ¶ Rom. vi. 3. See Mr. McLEAN'S *Nature and Import of Baptism*, p. 6. \*\* Luke xii. 50. Matt. iii. 11. 1 Cor. x. 2.



LED unto Moses, in the cloud and in the sea—According to us, the manner of reading these passages will be this; *I have an IMMERSION to be IMMERSED with, and how am I straitned till it be accomplished!—He shall IMMERSE you in the Holy Spirit and in fire—And were all IMMERSED unto Moses, in the cloud and in the sea.*—In regard to Luke xii. 50. if you render the word baptism by the term washing, you not only sink the vigorous idea, but convey a sentiment foreign to the text. For the term *washing* plainly suggests the notion of cleansing; whereas it is manifest, that our Lord here speaks of *himself* personally—of himself, not as to be *cleansed* from sin, but *punished* for it; or, as the Apostle asserts, MADE A CURSE FOR US. To adopt the word *pouring*, would exceedingly dilute and impoverish the marvellous meaning, if not render the passage absolutely unintelligible: and, to use the term *sprinkling*, common sense turns abhorrent; as it would render the emphatical and admirable text quite ridiculous. For who can seriously imagine that our Lord intended to represent his most bitter sufferings, by the act of sprinkling a few drops of water on a person? No; he designed to express this being ‘baptized, or plunged, into death,’ as BUCENHAGIUS interprets the passage\*. So that though the term baptism is here used by way of allusion; and though I am far from thinking that the allusive sense of a word should be the rule of interpreting the same expression in a positive divine law; yet, as all pertinent metaphors have a literal and proper sense for their foundation, we may conclude, that if it be possible for any word when used metaphorically, to express the idea of im-

\* In *Biblioth. Bremens.* Class. II. p. 665.

*merſion, plunging, overwelming*; we have it here in the term *baptiſm*. The ſame obſervations will apply to a ſimilar text, Matt. xx. 22. *Are ye able to—be baptized with the baptiſm that I am baptized with?* which Dr. DODDRIDGE thus paraphraſes: ‘Are you able to—be baptized with the baptiſm, and *plunged* into that ſea of ſufferings with which I am *ſhortly* to be baptized, and, as it were, *overwhelmed* for a time?’—In reſpect of the two other paſſages, whether our ſenſe of the word in queſtion, or that of Pædobaptiſts, be more emphatical, and the language more agreeable, my Reader will determine.

Further: If it be lawful to adminiſter the ordinance before us by pouring or ſprinkling, equally as by immerſion; it muſt be, becauſe that diverſity of adminiſtration is warranted, either by the command of our divine Lawgiver, or by the practice of his Apoſtles. But if ſo, is it not very ſurpriſing that the ſacred Penmen of the New Teſtament, when recording precepts and facts for our direction in this affair, have never uſed a term, the *natural* and *primary* meaning of which, is pouring, or ſprinkling? This is the more ſurpriſing, as, in other caſes, apparently of much leſs conſequence to the purity of divine worſhip, they frequently employ ſuch words as are adapted to expreſs thoſe ideas without any ambiguity. If *pouring*, for inſtance, be a legitimate way of performing the rite, what can be the reaſon that βάλλω, ἐκχέω, ἐπιχέω, ἐκχύνω, κατεχέω, προσχέω, or προσχυσις, (all which are found in the apoſtolic writings), is never uſed in the New Teſtament, concerning the adminiſtration of baptiſm? Or, if *ſprinkling* be a proper mode of proceeding, how comes it that ραντίζω, ραντισμός, or ſome other term of the ſame ſignification, does not appear in any command  
or

or precedent, relating to the subject of this controversy? Why should those Greek words I have just mentioned, and all others of a similar meaning, (whether used by Pagan classics, or the Septuagint translators) be excluded from precepts and examples of the institution before us; while βαπτίζω, βάπτισμα, and βάπτισμος, are appropriated to that service, if pouring or sprinkling had been at all intended by our Lord, or ever practised by his Apostles? See No. 49. It must not be supposed, as JOS. PLACÆUS has justly observed in another case, that this was done by inspired writers without design\*: and on our principles the reason is plain. The great Legislator intended that his followers should be IMMERSED, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit: in pursuance therefore of this design, such words are used concerning the ordinance, as naturally and properly signify that idea.—We have, I think, as much reason to conclude that βαπτίζω and βάπτισμα are terms of opposite significations, as that βάπτισμα and περιβάπτισμα denote things intended for opposite uses. The former of these names, it is well known, was applied by ancient Christians to the baptismal font; because candidates for communion were immersed in it: the latter, it is equally clear, was appropriated by Pagan Greeks to the vessel which contained their holy water; because thence the idolatrous priest sprinkled the consecrated element upon each worshipper†. What then would the learned say, were any one pretending to an acquaintance with Christian and Greek antiquities, designedly to confound the two latter expressions, as if they

\* Opera, Tom. II. p. 267. † SUICERI Thesaurus Eccles. Tom. I. p. 659. Dr. POTTER's Antiquities of Greece, Vol. I. Chap. iv. p. 195.

were convertible terms? Be the just censure what it might, I cannot help thinking it is due to those who confound the two former, by labouring to prove them equivalent, in regard to the ordinance before us. Though our Brethren maintain the lawfulness of *pouring* and *sprinkling*, they cannot produce one instance from the divine rubric of this institution, of any word being used which primarily and plainly expresses either of those actions.—It is very remarkable, that while few or none of our learned opponents dare deny, that the term baptism conveys the idea of immersion; and while none of them, so far as I have observed, venture to assert, that it never means any thing besides pouring or sprinkling; yet, in their *practice*, pouring, or sprinkling, is constantly used. Thus what is allowed by learned men in general to be the *radical* idea of a capital term in divine law, is entirely kept out of sight; while a presumed *secondary* sense, is the only thing that appears in their mode of proceeding.

Dr. ADDINGTON, indeed, says; ‘We have not met with *one* text, in the whole Bible, that requires the immersion of the whole body\*.’ Just so, I remember, SOCINUS declared, that he could not find one text which requires either immersion or sprinkling. The people called Quakers adopt similar language. Nor could the whole Council of Trent meet with so much as one text that enjoins those whom they call the laity, to partake of wine at the Lord’s table†. ‘So hard a thing is it’, says Mr. REEVES, ‘to find any text plain enough for some men‡!’—But though Dr. ADDINGTON has not met with one text, which

\* *Christian Minister's Reasons*, p. 176. † *Seff.* XXI. Cap. i.

‡ *Apologies*, Vol. I. Preface, p. 84. Edit, 1709.

he considers as requiring immersion, many of those learned authors with whose language the Reader has been entertained, seem to be of a different opinion : and if the native signification of the term baptism, be immersion ; the action so called must be *required*, wherever divine law enjoins the administration of baptism. This must be the case, except it can be proved, that the leading terms of a law should be understood in a real, or supposed, secondary sense. Has, then, Dr. ADDINGTON met with any text which requires *pouring*, or *sprinkling*, in opposition to immersion ? Has he found any passage of sacred writ, that *enjoins* pouring or sprinkling water on the *face*, in contradistinction to plunging the whole body ? He will not, I think, dare to assert either the one or the other. But if immersion be not *required*, in contradistinction to pouring and sprinkling ; and if pouring or sprinkling be not *required*, in opposition to immersion ; we should consider it as a favour, if this opponent would inform us what is required. For the question relates to the *mind of CHRIST* : it regards the meaning of a *divine LAW* : nor can we forbear thinking, that *something* is required, *really* and in *earnest* required, which is called *baptism* ; or else our Protestant principles would reclaim against us, for performing any thing under that name as a branch of holy worship. While, therefore, any of our opposers deny that *immersion* is required, they are obliged to prove, either, that their own mode of proceeding has the sanction of a *divine requisition*, exclusively of ours ; or, that the Most High has, for once, consulted the honour of the human will, by leaving the manner of performing a positive rite of religion entirely at the option of his worshippers.

The

The former will be an arduous task; the latter is pregnant with impious absurdity.

REFLECT. VII. While the Pædobaptists maintain that our great Lawgiver intended any thing less than *dipping* the subject of the ordinance, whether it be washing, pouring, or sprinkling; it is necessary for them to consider, whether his design was, that water should be applied, in any of these ways, to the *whole body*, or to some *particular part*. If the former, why do they not comply with his requisition? Why make such a partial application of the element? If the latter, what part must it be? Some pour water on the *back part* of the head, and call it baptism\*. Others have *washed the face*, pronounced the prescribed form of words, and thought the institution was rightly administered†. What, if others were to wash the *hands* of a candidate, call it baptism, and plead, that washing the hands was a religious rite appointed by Jehovah‡: Nay, what if some should wash the *feet*, pronounce it baptism, and appeal to John xiii. 10. in justification of their conduct§? I leave the Reader to consider, whether a minister has not as good a warrant from the New Testament thus to proceed, as to pour water upon,

\* Bp. BURNET'S *Second Letter of his Travels*, p. 85.      † Mr. NEALE'S *Hist. Purit.* Vol. I. p. 543, 544. Octav. Edit.      ‡ Deut. xxi. 6.

§ The *pedilavium* practised in early times, was actually considered by some, in the beginning of the fourth century, as a proper substitute for baptism; on which account, washing of the feet by the bishop was forbidden by the Council of Eliberis. See Dr. GILL, on John xiii. 15.—The church of Milan practised washing of the feet, 'because Adam was *supplanted* by the devil, and the serpent's 'poison was cast upon his *feet*; therefore men were washed in that 'part for greater sanctification, that he might have no power to 'supplant them any farther.' Mr. BINGHAM'S *Orig. Ecclesiast.* B. XII. Chap. iv. § 10.

or to sprinkle the *face*; and then to conclude, that the party is duly baptized.—It has been the opinion of some, that a child is baptized, on whatever part of his body the water may fall \*: and we may justly demand, By what law of Christ, or by what example of the Apostles, is any one authorized to apply water to the face, or the head; rather than to the hands, the feet, or any other part of the body? It should never be forgotten,† that the institution about which we treat, is of a positive kind; and that we are not at liberty to perform it as we please, but are bound to observe the law of administration enacted by our divine Sovereign. See CHAP. I.

In opposition to this partial application of water, it may be further observed, That when Jehovah appointed circumcision, he expressly mentioned the part on which it should be performed. When also he commanded a topical application of the sacrificial blood and the anointing oil, he did not fail to describe the parts intended †: and such was the obligation of his directions in reference to these affairs, that if Abraham had circumcised a *finger*, instead of the *foreskin*; or had the blood and the oil been applied to any other parts of the body, than those that were specified, guilt would have been contracted, and the anger of the Lord incurred. So, on the other hand, when God enjoined the priests or the people to *bathe*; had they only sprinkled the *face*, poured water on the *hands*, or washed the *feet*, they would have been equally culpable. Now, baptism being a positive institution, as well as those ancient rites; what reason can be assigned, if water should be applied only to a particular part of the body, why

\* VENEM, *Hist. Eccles.* Tom. VI, p. 192.      † Lev. xiv. 14, 17.

† hat

that part was not mentioned, either in the institution of the ordinance, or in some apostolic example of its administration? yet I do not remember to have observed, that any of our opponents pretend that it is.

REFLECT. VIII. That extraordinary communication of spiritual gifts and of divine influence, which the disciples of Christ received at the feast of Pentecost, being called the *baptism*, of the Holy Spirit; and the Holy Spirit being represented as *poured out*, and *falling upon*, those first ministers in the Messiah's kingdom; our Brethren have often pleaded these facts in opposition to us, and in favour of their own practice. In answer to which, I would propose the following things to consideration.

The word *baptism* is here manifestly used in an improper and allusive sense: for there is no more literal propriety in speaking of the Holy Spirit being *poured*, or *sprinkled*, upon those first disciples of our ascended Lord, than in representing them as *immersed* in the Holy Spirit. Must we, then, expound the principal term of a divine law, which is to be literally understood, by a merely *allusive* expression? so expound it, as to depart from its native, primary, and obvious meaning? It has been common for learned men to examine the propriety of metaphorical and allusive terms, upon the foundation of their literal and primary meaning; but never, that I have observed, to consider an allusive application of them, as the standard of their literal sense. Yet this is the case here. For our dispute is about the meaning of the term *baptism*, in a *proper*, *literal* sense, and as occurring in divine law: to determine which, our Brethren appeal to an *improper*, and an *allusive* sense of the word, as used



with reference to a supernatural fact. This, we think, is very extraordinary. For if the command to baptize need any explanation from subsequent facts, it seems natural for us to have recourse—not to the language of metaphor, nor to any expression that is merely allusive;—but, to apostolic practice in the administration of baptism: because, by making allusive expressions the rule of interpreting literal commands, any divine law may soon be explained away.—For instance: Had the mode of interpretation adopted by our opponents been approved and applied by the ancient Hebrews to the command of circumcision, they might have evaded the painful rite. They would, it is likely, have reasoned thus: 'The law of circumcision is plainly symbolical; and the chief moral instruction suggested by it, is the circumcision of *the heart*. But that is not the mutilating, or the impairing, of any *natural* power: it is no other than the superinducing of mental purity, by an alteration of moral qualities. If, then, there be a just correspondence, as doubtless there is, between the rite itself and its principal moral design, the preputium should not be *cut off*, but some way or other *purified*.'—Thus the order of Jehovah might have been evaded under a fair pretext, and the divine rite essentially altered. I cannot help thinking, therefore, that when our Brethren, in the case before us, make such appeals to miraculous agency and metaphorical expression, they tacitly confess that the obvious meaning of the word baptism, and primitive practice, afford their cause but little assistance.

Again: As it is not uncommon for us to speak of being *immersed* in debt, in business, or in care; and of being *plunged* in grief, or in ruin; so we are never considered

considered as using these metaphorical expressions with elegance, or with propriety, except so far as the analogical sense in which we employ them, points to their literal and primary meaning. The following rules among various others have in this case been given. 'It ought to be remembered, that all figurative ways of using words or phrases suppose a natural and literal meaning\*.' 'The figurative sense must have a relation to that which is proper; and the more intimate the relation, the figure is the more happy—The proper sense of the word ought to bear some proportion to the figurative sense, and not soar much above it, nor sink much below it—To draw consequences from a figure of speech, as if the word were to be understood literally, is a gross absurdity†.—Pertinent, on this occasion, is the language of CHRYSOSTOM, who speaks of *being BAPTIZED, or immersed, in cares innumerable*: *μυριας βαπτίζομενος φροντισιν*: and again, to the same effect, *ὕπο πληθος φροντιδων του νου βεβαπτισμενον εχοντες*. So BASIL the Great, describing a person who stands immovably against the storms of temptation and persecution, calls him *αβαπτιστος ψυχη*, *a soul unbaptized, or not overwhelmed*‡.' See No. 31. 82. Now here the very term in question is used in a metaphorical way; yet so used, as plainly to retain its obvious and primary meaning. But how disagreeably would it sound, seriously to say of a man that owes but a few pence, He is *immersed* in debt? or, of one whose heart is broken with sorrow, He is *sprinkled* with

\* Dr. REID's *Essays on the Intellectual Powers of Man*, p. 74.  
 † *Encyclopæd. Britan.* under the Article *FIGURE of Speech*. See also Dr. WARD's *System of Oratory*, Vol. I. p. 386. ‡ Apud SCHNEIDERIUM, *Biblioth. Brem. Class. vii.* p. 638. Vid. SUICERII *Thesaur. Ecclæs.* Tom. I. p. 623.

grief? The most illiterate would be struck with such a glaring impropriety. When, therefore, we consider this metaphorical use of the term baptism, as expressive of that divine energy, and that assemblage of wonderful gifts, which were granted in the primitive times to fit the Apostles for their arduous work; the analogical sense of the word *baptism*, will appear much more elegant and much more emphatical on our principles, than on those of our opposers. Dr. WARD has observed that ‘we say, *floods* of fire, and ‘*clouds* of smoke, for large quantities\*’; so when the Scripture speaks of being *baptized* with, or *in*, the Holy Spirit, the *great abundance* of his gifts and graces must be intended.—One of our English authors has used the words, ‘*dipped* in scandal†.’ Now thus to represent a person is much more expressive of that opprobrium under which he lies, than if it were said; His character is greatly *asperged*: or, Infamy is *poured* upon him; because it immediately leads us to think of his being *overwhelmed* with reproachful charges.—Dr. OWEN speaks of ‘being *baptized into* ‘the spirit of the gospel‡.’ As it is plain that the word *baptized* cannot here mean poured, or sprinkled; (for, what sense is there in representing a *person* as poured, or sprinkled, *into* any thing?) so it is equally plain, that the author’s words more strongly express the sanctifying power of the gospel on the human heart, than if he had talked of the spirit of the gospel being poured or sprinkled upon a profane or of religion.—Thus, in the present case, we have a much stronger idea of that sacred influence, and of those heavenly donatives, with which the Apostles were in-

\* Ut supra, p. 404.

† Notice on Mr. PORE’s *Dunciad*, p. 123.

Edit. 1709.

‡ *Discourse on the Holy Spirit*, B. IV. Chap. i.

dulged at the feast of Pentecost, by retaining the primary meaning of the word in question; than by thinking of some possible, but remote sense of the term. For as the analogical signification of the same word, when used of our Lord's unparalleled sufferings, would be so diluted as to become ridiculous, or unintelligible, were we to consider the allusion as made to the act of pouring, or of sprinkling, a few drops of water upon any person; so, in regard to the baptism of the Holy Spirit, we must either abide by the natural sense of the term, or greatly impoverish the scriptural notion of that wonderful fact. Though all true believers are partakers of a divine influence, yet they are not all baptized in the Holy Spirit. For as those afflictions which are common to the disciples of Christ, are not the baptism of sufferings; so neither are those communications of divine influence, which are common to real saints, the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

Further: Our Brethren themselves I think will allow, that a person may be *so* surrounded with subtle effluvia; that a liquid may be *so* poured, or it may *so* distil upon him, that he may be *as if* immersed in it. A certain writer, when speaking about the different applications of electricity for the cure of diseases, says; 'The first is the electrical *bath*; so called, because it surrounds the patient with an atmosphere of the electrical fluid, in which he is *plunged*, and receives positive electricity\*.' This philosophical document reminds me of the sacred historian's language, where narrating the fact under consideration. Thus he speaks: *And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place. And*

\* Monthly Review, Vol. LXXII. p. 486.

*suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues, like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost\*.* Now if the language of medical electricity be just, it cannot be absurd, nay, it seems highly rational, to understand this language of Inspiration as expressive of that idea for which we contend. Was the Holy Spirit *poured out*, did the Holy Spirit *fall upon*, the Apostles and others, at that memorable time? it was in such a manner, and to such a degree, that they were, like a patient in the electric bath, *as if immersed* in it. Did our opposers thus consider the term *pour*, in this connection, we should not object; because the primary and evident meaning of the word *baptism* would be still preserved in their explanation of its allusive sense. But to suppose, that the pouring a *very small* quantity of water, or the falling of *a few drops*, on the face of a person, is a just emblem of that metaphorical baptism, is quite incongruous; as it enervates and almost annihilates that grand idea which the Scripture gives of the marvellous fact. See No. 42.

Once more: We have the pleasure to find that various authors, who were not under the influence of Antipædobaptist sentiments, express themselves agreeably to our view of the case. CYRIL of Jerusalem, about the middle of the fourth century, speaks thus: 'As he, *ὁ ἐνδύνων ἐν τοῖς ὕδασι*, who is plunged in water and baptized, is encompassed by the water on every side; so are they that are wholly baptized by the Spirit†.'—CASAUBON: 'Βαπτίζειν is to immerse

\* Acts ii. 1, 2, 3, 4.

† In Dr. GILL's *Exposit.* on Acts i. 5.

—and

• —and in this sense the Apostles are truly said to be  
 • baptized; for the house in which this was done was fil-  
 • led with the Holy Ghost, so that the Apostles seemed to  
 • be plunged into it, as into a fishpool\*. —GROTIUS:  
 • 'To be baptized here, is not to be slightly sprinkled,  
 • but to have the Holy Spirit abundantly poured upon  
 • them†.' —COR. *a* LAPIDE, MENOCHIVS, and  
 • TIRINUS: 'A copious effusion of the Holy Spirit, is  
 • called the baptism of the Holy Spirit‡.' —WITSI-  
 • UTS: 'A very great communication of the fiery or  
 • purifying Spirit, is called baptism, because of its  
 • abundance§.' —Dr. DODDRIDGE: 'He [Christ]  
 • shall baptize you with a most plentiful effusion of the  
 • Holy Spirit||.' See No. 3, 8, 51, 53. To all which  
 I may add, as the baptism of water was administered  
*εν ὕδατι*, IN water¶; in Jordan\*\*; and in Enon††;  
 so the New Testament uniformly represents the recipi-  
 ents of this heavenly baptism, as baptized *εν πνευματι  
 ἁγίῳ*, IN the Holy Spirit‡‡; which unavoidably leads  
 us to the proper and primary sense of the word bap-  
 tism, rather than to any supposed secondary meaning  
 that can be imagined.

REFLECT. IX. In opposition to all these autho-  
 rities and all this reasoning, Mr. JOHN HORSEY

\* In Dr. GILL'S *Ancient Mode of Baptizing*, p. 22. 23. + Apud  
 PETER SYMPSON, ad Act. i. 5. † *Ibid.* § *Miscel. Sac. Tom. II.*  
 p. 535. ¶ *Paraphrase*, on Matt. iii. 11. ¶ Matt. iii. 11.  
 Mark i. 8. John i. 26, 31, 33. So MONTANUS; so the Vulgate,  
 Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic Versions; and so LE CENE, SIMON,  
 and others, in their French Versions, together with WETHAM'S  
 English translation published at Doway, render Matt. iii. 11. with  
 whom TINDAL'S Translation, CRANMER'S Bible, and the  
 Bishops' Bible, as they are usually called, agree. N. B. What is  
 here said respecting the French versions, and our old English trans-  
 lations, depends on the observation of a Friend. \*\* Matt. iii. 6.  
 Mark i. 9. †† John iii. 23. ‡‡ Matt. iii. 11. Mark i. 8.  
 Luke iii. 16. John i. 33. Acts i. 5. and xi. 16.

is of opinion, that the word baptism is 'an equivocal, open, general term'—That nothing is determined by it further 'than this, that water should be applied to the subject *in some form or other*'—That 'the mode of use,' is 'only the ceremonial part of a positive institute; just as, in the supper of our Lord, the time of day, the number and posture of communicants, the quality and quantity of bread and wine, are circumstances not accounted essential by any party of Christians'—That 'sprinkling, pouring, and plunging are perfectly equivalent, equally valid'—And, that if our Lord had designed to confine his followers to 'a particular mode, exclusive of all others,' he would hardly have used 'an open general term, (*βαπτίζω*)' but 'a word decided and limited in its import.' He adds, 'The Greek language would have furnished him with terms indisputably precise and exact. Of this kind have been reckoned, and I think properly, *καταβυθίζω, καταποντίζω, καταδυνω* or *καταδυω*, not to say *δυσκτω* and *βυθίζω*\*.'—MR. EDWARD WILLIAMS, when adverting to the same subject, says; 'As the most eminent criticks, commentators and lexicographers are divided in their verdict, respecting the acceptance of the term *Baptizo*, and consequently the intention of our Saviour's command to baptize; and as the *practice* of the disciples whence we should gather in what sense they understood it, is attended with considerable difficulty, when reduced to any one invariable method—we should vary it according to circumstances, and in proportion as demonstrable evidence is wanting, refer the mode to the private judgment of the person or persons concerned†.' Such are the views and such is the lan-

\* *Infant Baptism Stated and Defended*, p. 15, 16, 17. Edit. 2d.

† *Notes on Mr. MORRIS'S Social Rectitude*, p. 131.

guage of Messrs. WILLIAMS and HORSEY: to whom I may say, as the Athenians to Paul, *You bring certain strange things to our ears, we would therefore know what these things mean.*

The word *Baptizo*, then, is an equivocal, open, general term; so equivocal and so obscure, that the most learned authors are divided about its meaning, in our Lord's command *to baptize*. This, however, is mere assertion: and, indeed, I should be sorry to see it proved, because it would greatly impeach the legislative character of Jesus Christ. For, as Baron MONTESQUIEU observes, 'The style [of laws] should be plain and simple; a direct expression being always better understood than an indirect one—It is an essential article that the words of the laws should [be adapted to] excite in every body the same ideas—The laws ought not to be subtle; they are designed for people of common understanding, not as an art of logic, but as the plain reason of a father of a family\*.' Now can it be supposed that our Lord would give a positive law of divine worship; a law that is obligatory on the most illiterate of his real disciples, in the very first stage of their Christian profession; and yet express it in such ambiguous language, that the most wise and eminent of all his followers cannot now understand it? Love to his character and zeal for his cause forbid the thought!—That ambiguity of which our Brethren speak, must, if real, have arisen in our great Legislator's conduct, either from incapacity, from inadvertency, or from design. Not the first; for he was undoubtedly able, clearly to have expressed his own meaning. Not the second; for no incogitancy could befall Him, in whom are all the

\* *Spirit of Laws*, B. XXIX. Chap. xvi.



*Treasures of wisdom and knowledge.* Not the last; for it would ill become One who declared himself possessor of all authority in heaven and in earth, to give a law of perpetual obligation, with an intention that nobody now should understand it.—A little to illustrate this, it may be observed; That his order to baptize, is a law—a law of equal force with that of the holy supper. This law extends its obliging power to all that are taught—so taught, as to be his disciples. For them to neglect or transgress it, therefore, must be a sin; and all sin exposes to punishment. If, then, the grand enacting term of this law be so equivocal, that no one can tell with certainty what it means, we may suppose it probable that, in ten thousand instances, a transgression of it has proceeded, not from any thing wrong in the hearts of our Lord's disciples, but from the *designed* obscurity of the law itself. Now a law designedly obscure is fitted for nothing so much as to multiply crimes and punishments. Such a law is unjust and cruel; consequently, could not proceed from our divine Sovereign.

Again: According to Mr. WILLIAMS's view of the case we may safely conclude, that the law of baptism is now *obsolete*: nay, in regard to us, that it never was *promulged*. The former; because when the enacting terms of a statute become unintelligible, it is high time to consider the law as antiquated. For to what purpose is a law considered as obligatory, when the most learned, sagacious, and impartial cannot understand it? Here we are landed at downright Quakerism, so far as baptism is concerned in it.—With regard to the latter, let the following things be observed. It is generally agreed, if I mistake not, that no positive law is obligatory till promulged: in  
other

other words, it is not a law. For what is meant by the term *law*, but a *rule of action* prescribed by sovereign authority? It cannot, however, be a *rule of action*, any further than it is made known. Agreeable to this, is the following language of Sir WILLIAM BLACKSTONE; 'A bare resolution confined in the breast of the legislator, without manifesting itself by some external sign, can never be properly a law. It is requisite that this resolution be notified to the people who are to obey it\*.' See CHAP. I. No. 12.—Now if any law, requiring a *single act* of obedience, as in the case before us, do not specify the act intended in such a manner as to be understood by those who read and study it without partiality, it is absurd to talk of its promulgation. For what is meant by promulgating a law, but publicly making known the commanding will of the legislator, with regard to this or the other affair? Yet this, according to Messrs. HORSEY and WILLIAMS, has not been done, respecting the law of baptism: for the principal word in that law is an *equivocal, open, general* term; and so *obscure* that the *most eminent* authors are divided about its meaning. Nor does the apostolic practice explain it. Our Lord, indeed, gave a command *to baptize*; by which it is universally understood, that he designed the performance of a *single action*; for nobody supposes, that sprinkling, pouring, and plunging, must all be united to constitute baptism. But what particular action he meant by the Greek verb, is quite as uncertain as what the Psalmist intended by the Hebrew term, *Selah*. All we can learn is this; As the latter seems to contain a direction to those concerned in the sacred music, to perform that music *in some way, or other*:

\* Comment. Vol. I. Introduct. Sect. ii.

so, the former denotes an application of water to the subject, 'in some form or other;' for, on the authority of Mr. HORSEY, nothing further is determined by it. Such is the *ne plus ultra* of its meaning! *The trumpet gives an uncertain sound, and who shall prepare himself to the battle?* It follows, therefore, on the principles opposed, that the law of baptism has not, with regard to us, been promulged.—We have been used to think that the *laws* of Christ were equally determinate, fixed, and plain, with the *gospel* of Christ: and Paul informs us that the gospel which he preached *was not yea and nay*; but always affirmative and always the same. Not so the law of baptism, if our opposers be right: for it is *this, that, and the other*; but nothing determinate, nothing certain.

*The principal enacting word in a positive law of the New Testament, an equivocal term; and so obscure, that the most eminent writers are divided about its meaning!* Strange, indeed. For, fond as our Brethren are of this idea, were either of them the legislator in a civil state, and to act a similar part, he would soon be accounted either a fool or a tyrant. But I am persuaded that his wisdom, his rectitude, and his benevolence, would all revolt at the thought of such a procedure. Admitting this representation of our Lord's conduct in his legislative capacity to be just and fair; mankind may think themselves happy that he has in this respect, had more imitators among the sovereigns of the earth. Britons, at least, would quickly be disposed to execrate the measures of Parliament, were the three estates to adopt the law, and act upon it.—How often and how justly have the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, been severely censured for their studied ambiguity? Thus Bp. STILLINGFLEET, concerning that

that matter : ' This was one of the great arts of that Council, to draw up their decrees in such terms as should leave room enough for eternal wranglings among themselves ; provided they agreed in doing the business effectually against the heretics, as they were pleased to call them\*.' Thus WERENFELSIUS : Integrity was wanting in the Fathers of the Trent Synod, when they studiously left ambiguity and obscurity, in a great part of their Canons and Decrees†. Whether, in thus acting, they had the supposed ambiguity of our Lord's canon concerning baptism in their eye, we dare not assert ; but every one must allow, if Messrs. HORSEY and WILLIAMS be right, that they might have pleaded the most venerable example for such a conduct.

ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΑ *an equivocal, open, general term ; a term which, with equal facility, admits the idea of plunging in Jordan, of pouring from the palm of the hand, and of sprinkling from the ends of the fingers ! Our Author might as well have asserted that its derivative, ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΗΡΙΟΝ, equally signifies a bath, large as King Solomon's brazen sea ; a font, small as those in our modern built parish churches ; and a basin, precisely of the same dimensions with those he commonly uses when sprinkling infants. But what would learning, what would impartiality have said, had he made such an assertion ?*

• *A capital word in positive divine law, an equivocal term—a term, so ambiguous and so obscure, that the most learned and upright do not with certainty know what it means ! Then we have need of an infallible judge ; and were there one at Rome, it would be*

\* *Preservative against Popery, Vol. II. Appendix, p. 103.*

† *Opuscula, p. 580.*

worth our while to visit his Holiness, that we might have the obscurity all removed. For while the Legislator considers himself as having fairly promulgated his law, whether we view its enacting terms as equivocal or univocal, it will prove a serious fact, that they who neglect or transgress it will not be held innocent.—With the idea of ambiguity, however, some of our Brethren seem delighted. But so were not the ancient Athenians! for Abp. POTTER informs us, that it was considered as *criminal*, for any person among them to propose a law in ambiguous terms\*. I have heard, indeed, that some of our pettifogging lawyers, boast the great uncertainty of our English law, with regard to the issue of numerous causes. Nor do I wonder at it. But that such worthy characters, as Messrs. HORSEY and WILLIAMS, should seek a refuge for their cause in the supposed uncertainty of Divine law, is truly amazing! Were they disputing with Roman Catholics, or discussing almost any subject of a theological kind, except that of Infant sprinkling; they would labour to establish against every opposer, the certainty, the precision, and the sufficiency of divine law and apostolic example. This at least has been the common practice of Protestants. For instance, TURRETTINUS, *de Baptismo*, speaks to the following effect: It is not lawful to suppose that Christ, in a very important affair of Christianity, would so express himself, that he could not be understood by any mortal†. Dr. RINGLEY: ‘In order to our yielding obedience, it is necessary that God should signify to us, in *what* instances he will be obeyed, and the *manner how* it is to be perform-

\* *Antiquities of Greece*, Vol. I. Chap. xxv. Edit. 1697.      † *Institut.* Loc. XIX. QUERUS, xviii. § 4.

‘ed; otherwise it would rather be fulfilling of our  
 ‘own will than his\*.’ Dr. OWEN: ‘The sole rea-  
 ‘son why he [the Apostle] did make use of it [the word  
 ‘*surety*] was, that from the nature and notion of it  
 ‘among men in other cases, we may understand the  
 ‘signification of it, what he intends by it—It is not  
 ‘for us to charge the Apostle with such obscurity, and  
 ‘expressing his mind in such uncouth terms †.’ Mr.  
 BENJAMIN BENNET: ‘’Tis a *reproach* to the  
 ‘Lawgiver, *blasphemy* against him, to suppose that  
 ‘any of his upright sincere subjects, cannot find out  
 ‘the meaning of his laws, with all their care and di-  
 ‘ligence, even in the necessary essential points of their  
 ‘faith and obedience‡.’ Mr. BRADBURY: ‘The  
 ‘words [of our Lord, Matt. xxviii. 19.] ought to be  
 ‘taken in their plain and natural sense, because they  
 ‘are a lasting form to the end of time. For Christ to  
 ‘give us expressions that people cannot understand,  
 ‘would be only to *abuse* them. ’Tis unworthy of  
 ‘Him who is the light of the world, in whose mouth  
 ‘there was no guile—[Such] is the plain and natural  
 ‘sense of the words; and therefore to twine and tor-  
 ‘ture them with conjectures and *maybe’s*, is making  
 ‘Christ, not a teacher, but a *barbarian*, by not uttering  
 ‘words that are easy to be understood ||.’ ANONY-  
 MOUS: ‘A confusion in terms would at length pro-  
 ‘duce entirely the same effect, as the confusion of lan-  
 ‘guages: vague and equivocal expressions would  
 ‘render the most accurate notions liable to continual  
 ‘contradictions, and expose truth itself to perpetual  
 ‘cavils. As the first intention of words is to make

\* *Body of Div. Quest.* xci, xcii. p. 491. † On Heb. vii. 22, 26.  
 Vol. III. p. 222, 256. ‡ *Irenicum*, p. 60. || *Duty and Doctr. of*  
*Bap.* p. 150, 173.

known our ideas to each other, the principal merit of every language [and of every discourse] must consist in the clearness and precision of its terms \*.

Bp. TAYLOR: 'It is certain God put no disguises upon his own commandments, and the words are meant plainly and heartily; and the further you remove from their *first* sense, the more you have lost the purpose of your rule †.' SAMUEL FOTHERGILL, one of the 'People called Quakers: 'Thou [Mr. PILKINTON] concludest, that *water baptism may be properly administered in any decent and convenient manner whatsoever*. Pray who must be judge of this decency and convenience? Any thing subjected to human decision, with respect to decency and convenience, wants, in my judgment, those characters of divine institution which become the religion of the holy Jesus; which is *not of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God ‡*.' Hence it appears, that the plea of our Brethren for a latitude of administration, from the supposed ambiguity of the law, is not only contrary to the avowed sentiments of Protestants in other cases, but an encouragement, to those who entirely reject the ordinance. See REFLECT. III. and CHAP. I. No. 4, 8, 12, 13, 20. REFLECT. II, III.

The following quotation, *mutatis mutandis*, will here apply with peculiar force. Thus, then, Mr. VINCENT ALSOP: 'I cannot imagine what greater reproach he [Dr. GOODMAN] could throw upon these famous [Thirty-nine] Articles and their worthy compilers, than to suggest that they were calcu-

\* *Monthly Review*, Vol. LXXIV. p. 537, 538. † *Duflor Dubitant*. B. I. Chap. i. p. 26. Vid. CHAMIFERUM, *Parfrat*. Tom. I. L. XV. C. IV. § 16. C. IX. § 2. ‡ *Remarks on an Address to the People called Quakers*, p. 6, 7.

' lated for all meridians and latitudes; as if the Church  
 ' did imitate Δοξιας, the Delphian Apollo, whose ora-  
 ' cles wore *two faces* under one hood, and were pen-  
 ' ned like those amphilogies that cheated CRESUS and  
 ' PYRRHUS into their destruction: or as if, like Ja-  
 ' nus, they looked *πρὸςσω καὶ ὀπίσσω*, *backwards and*  
 ' *forwards*; and like the untouched needle, stood in-  
 ' differently to be interpreted through the two and  
 ' thirty points of the compass. The Papists do never  
 ' more maliciously reproach the Scripture, than when  
 ' they call it *a Lesbian rule*; *a nose of wax*; *a leaden*  
 ' *dagger*; *a pair of seaman's trowsers*; *a moveable*  
 ' *dial*, you may make it what o'clock you please: and  
 ' yet they never arrived at that height of blasphemy, as  
 ' to say it was *industriously* so penned by the Amanu-  
 ' enses of the Holy Ghost. I dare not entertain so  
 ' little charity for an assembly of holy and learned  
 ' men, convened upon so solemn an occasion, that  
 ' they would play *leger de-main*, and contrive us a  
 ' system of divinity which should be *Instrumentum*  
 ' *pucis non veritatis*. The Conventicle of Trent, in-  
 ' deed, acted like themselves, that is, a pack of jugglers,  
 ' who, when they were gravelled and knew not how  
 ' to hush the noise and importunate glamoſr of the  
 ' bickering factions, the craftier leading men found  
 ' out *a temper*, as they called it, to skin over that  
 ' wound which they could not heal, and durst not  
 ' search. And what was the success of these carnal  
 ' policies? only this, both parties retained their dif-  
 ' fering opinions, believed just as they did before—and  
 ' yet their opinions were directly contrary to one ano-  
 ' ther, though both supposed to agree with the decree  
 ' of the Council—If *the trumpet gives an uncertain*  
 ' *found*, it is all one as if it were not founded. That  
 ' which is every thing and every where, is nothing  
 ' and



\* and nowhere. That which has no determinate sense,  
 † has no sense; and that's very near akin to nonsense.  
 \* The Jews indeed have a tradition, that the manna was  
 † what every man's appetite could relish; and such a  
 † religion would these men invent as should be most  
 \* flexible—Strange it is, that religion of all things in the  
 \* world should be unfixed, and like Delos, or O-Bra-  
 \* zile, float up and down in various and uncertain con-  
 \* jectures\*! Perfectly similar are the animadversions  
 of Dr. EDWARDS on Bp. BURNET's *Exposition of*  
*the Thirty Nine Articles*; for among other things he  
 says: 'He hath made the Articles of our Church a  
 † nose of wax, and accordingly he bends and wrests  
 † them which way he pleases—According to this  
 † learned Prelate we do not know the meaning of a  
 † great part of our Articles; and consequently they  
 † are of no use, for what is unintelligible is so—This  
 \* way of dealing with the Articles seems to me to be a  
 \* very severe reflection on our first Reformers, the  
 † pious and learned compilers of these Articles, as if  
 † they were not able to write or dictate sense; or  
 † could not speak grammatically and so as to be un-  
 \* derstood; or as if they purposely designed obscurity,  
 \* and that in some of the most considerable points of  
 \* our religion; as if they studied to perplex men's  
 \* minds, and ensnare their consciences—If the  
 \* words and expressions be voted doubtful and of  
 \* uncertain signification, the thing itself, the matter  
 † couched in them, will soon be insignificant and  
 \* vain†.'

But why should the word *baptism* be esteemed so  
 equivocal and so obscure? Is it because, in different

\* *Sober Inquiry*, p. 60, 61.      † *Discourse concerning Truth and Er-  
 ror*, p. 425, 429.

connections, it is used in various acceptations; such as immersion, washing, pouring, and sprinkling? For the sake of argument, and for that only, we admit the reality of those various acceptations. But is that a sufficient reason for pronouncing the word *equivocal*, and for considering the sense of it in divine law as *uncertain*? If so, we shall find comparatively but few terms in any language that are not equivocal and of dubious meaning. The Reader needs only to dip into a Hebrew, or a Greek Lexicon; into AINSWORTH'S Latin, or JOHNSON'S English Dictionary, to be convinced of this. The following instances, which have some affinity with the subject of our dispute, may serve as a specimen.

מָחַל is the word most commonly used, to signify the *act* of circumcising; and if that idea be not expressed by it, we may safely conclude there is never a term in the Hebrew language which can express it. Yet besides that sense, and its prepositional acceptations which are various, it has the general signification of *cutting off*, *cutting down*, and *cutting to pieces*. So it is used in Psalm lviii. 7. xc. 6. cxviii. 10, 11, 12. and in other places. מַחֵל is another word sometimes used for the same action: but besides its being equally various in its acceptation, as a verb, it is the name of an *ant*, or of some little insect, that is very sagacious and provident; and is supposed to *cut* or  *nibble* grains of corn to fit them for being stowed up in the earth.— On these two Hebrew roots the learned GUSSETIUS has the following remark: ‘ Though they do not occur in the conjugation Kal, except in the sacramental or typical signification of circumcising; yet this is not to be considered as their primary sense, but only as a species of their general signification of *cutting*; which, therefore, is their proper meaning—

‘ The

‘The genuine, general signification is to be fetched from Psalm xc. 6. and cxviii. 10\*.’—עָרַל is used for the *foreskin*; but its general and leading idea is, as Dr. TAYLOR informs us, a *superfluous incumbrance*; and Mr. JULIUS BATE says its primary meaning is, *the top*, or *protuberance*. Mr. BATE further observes, מָל we render, *to circumcise*; but there is no *circum* in the Hebrew. It is to cut off *the top*, or *protuberance*; for so עָרַל, which was cut off, signifies†. The words מוֹל *Mul*, and נָמַל *Namal*, says QUENSTEDIUS, do not necessarily signify such an amputation of the foreskin that no part of it remains; and therefore it may be true circumcision if the extremity of it be cut off.—The Scripture says, *Ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin*. Had the *whole* præputium been strictly to be understood, it would have been said, either, *all the flesh of your foreskin*; or, *the flesh of your whole foreskin*‡.

Now had there been any controversy among the Jews, in the latter times of their civil state, about the manner of performing circumcision; they might, on the principles of our opposers, have reasoned thus: ‘The forementioned words of our law are *equivocal, open, general terms*; by which nothing is determined, but that a *superfluous incumbrance* (the *top*, or *protuberance*, of something pertaining to the subject) should be, *in some form or other*, cut, or cut

\* Comment. Ebraicæ, sub Rad. מוֹל. † See Dr. TAYLOR'S Heb. Concord. Rad. 1165, 1414. Mr. BATE'S Critica Heb. p. 315, 453, 454. ALBERTI Post. Ling. Sanct. sub Rad. מוֹל. ‡ Antiq. Bib. Euseb. Hist. Div. I. C. iii. p. 270. Whiteberg 1699. See AINSWORTH'S Latin Dict. under the words *Circumcise*, and *Circumcisus*, for the various acceptations of those Latin terms.

off. We may therefore cut, or pare, the nails of our fingers, or of our toes, instead of circumcising the foreskin. For the cutting required, is merely the ceremonial part of a positive institute ; and therefore only a *circumstance*, like that of number, of time, of gesture, or of place, in various other affairs. If a sharp instrument be but applied to any part of our bodies, so as to make an incision\*, or an amputation of something belonging to our own persons ; it is perfectly equivalent, equally valid, with cutting off the *præputium*.—Besides, the latter is harsh, severe, and indecent, especially with regard to adult persons : it shocks our feelings, and exposes us to a thousand reproaches amongst our Gentile neighbours.—We have indeed our doubts, whether it was originally practised in that rigid sense for which some of our brethren plead. But were it incontestibly proved, that our father Abraham actually circumcised his foreskin, and that his immediate descendants followed his example ; there are, we conceive, sufficient reasons for our adopting a different method. The faith and obedience of the renowned Abraham, we all know, were tried in a singular manner on various occasions : and, perhaps, the blessed God might give him some intimation of his will respecting the rite in question, which, not being intended for general obligation, was not recorded by the inspired Writer. But it is the language of God as penned by Moses, that is the rule of our conduct ; and it is plain that the words are of an equivocal, open, general meaning, and far from being confined to the

\* The learned VANDER WAAYEN informs us, that circumcision, as performed by the Arabians and some others, is only an incision made in the *præputium*, which afterwards is entirely healed. *Varia Sacra*, p. 332, 333.

• **circumcising of the præputium.** It should be care-  
 • fully remembered also, that our great progenitor and  
 • his immediate offspring, lived in times when civili-  
 • zation and a sense of delicacy were far from having  
 • arrived at their present stage of refinement : nor  
 • had our venerable Fathers much intercourse with the  
 • nations around them. Now it is evident, that what  
 • was considered as decent, or not much disgusting, in  
 • a rude uncultivated age ; may become, in a course  
 • of time, quite the reverse. This we apprehend is a  
 • fact in the case before us. So that were we to in-  
 • sist on performing the ceremony in that sanguinary  
 • and painful manner, for which some few contend ;  
 • it would be an insuperable bar to the polished  
 • Greeks and Romans around us becoming profelytes  
 • to our divine religion, and an occasion perhaps of  
 • their final ruin. But who can imagine that the  
 • God of Israel would be pleased with such scrupulo-  
 • sity, as tended to continue the Heathens in their  
 • idolatry ? a scrupulosity too, about that which is no  
 • where *precisely* and *incontrovertibly* required. We  
 • remember with pleasure, nor can we forget that  
 • condescending declaration of God, recorded by one  
 • of our minor Prophets ; *I desired mercy and not ju-*  
 • *crifice ; and the knowledge of God, more than burnt*  
 • *offerings.* To enforce the rite in a manner so dis-  
 • gusting to the delicacy and ease of our polite neigh-  
 • bours, who may be at any time inclined to forsake  
 • their old superstitions, and to shelter themselves un-  
 • der the wings of the Schechina, would be like *putting*  
 • *new wine into old bottles*, and greatly retard the pro-  
 • gress of our holy religion.' Thus, on the principles  
 • of our Brethren, and in their language, *mutatis mu-*  
 • *landis*, might the Jews have reasoned away a divine  
 • command.

Again :

Again: Were our opposers to apply their principles and reasonings concerning the word *baptism* to one of those Greek verbs that were used by our Lord in the institution of his last supper; many of them would be presented with a new discovery, both of the nature and the design of the ordinance. For, when contemplating its administration, they would soon behold, with Roman Catholics and some others, the officiating minister wearing the character of a *priest*, and *offering* a sacrifice to God. The original word, to which I advert, is the verb ποιεῖν; which signifies *to do*, as plainly as βαπτίζειν signifies *to dip*. Ποιεῖν, however, in different connections, admits a great number of acceptations; no fewer, even in the New Testament, according to Mr. PARKHURST, than *twenty six*: and among others, like *facere*, to which it answers, it undoubtedly signifies, in some passages of the Greek classics and of the Septuagint version, *to offer*, or *present an oblation* to God. On this remote sense of the term, the propriety of talking about a *priest* at the Lord's table; about his *offering* the bread and wine; about an *altar*, and a *sacrifice*, chiefly depends: just as the practice of pouring or sprinkling, instead of immersion, depends on a supposed secondary sense of the word βαπτίζειν. But let us hear Dr. BRETT on the subject.

‘ There is yet, says he, a more evident proof to be  
 ‘ found in the Scripture, even in the very words of  
 ‘ the institution, to prove that we are required to *of-*  
 ‘ *fer* the bread and wine to God, when we celebrate  
 ‘ the holy eucharist—*This do in remembrance of me.*  
 ‘ Dr. HICKES, in his *Christian Priesthood*, p. 58, &c.  
 ‘ proves by a great many instances, that the word  
 ‘ ποιεῖν, *to do*, also signifies *to offer*, and is very fre-  
 ‘ quently used both by profane authors, and by the  
 ‘ Greek

• Greek Translators of the Old Testament in that sense;  
 • and so also is the Latin word *facere*. I will tran-  
 • scribe a few of those instances, and those who desire  
 • more may consult Dr. HICKES's book. HERO-  
 • DOTUS, Lib. I. Cap. cxxxii. says; *Without one of*  
 • *the Magi it is not lawful for them, ποιεισθαι, to offer*  
 • *a sacrifice*. And in the Septuagint translation of the  
 • Old Testament, which all the learned know is fol-  
 • lowed by the Writers of the New Testament, even  
 • where they cite the words and speeches of our Sa-  
 • viour, it is so used; as Exod. xxix. 36. *Thou shalt*  
 • *offer, ποιησεις, a bullock*: Verse 38. *This is that which,*  
 • *ποιησεις, thou shalt offer upon the altar*: Verse 39.  
 • *The one lamb, ποιησεις, thou shalt offer in the morning,*  
 • *and the other lamb, ποιησεις, thou shalt offer in the*  
 • *evening*. So likewise Exod. x. 25. In all which  
 • places the word which is translated *offer*, and which  
 • in this last text is translated *sacrifice*, and which in  
 • these and many other places will bear *no other* sense,  
 • is the very word which in the institution of the eu-  
 • charist is translated DO. And even our English  
 • translators have sometimes used the word DO in  
 • this sacrificial sense; as particularly Lev. iv. 20.  
 • Here our English translation is, *And he shall do*  
 • *with the bullock, as he did with the bullock for a sin-*  
 • *offering, so shall he do with this*. Here indeed they  
 • have put in the word, *with*, without any authority:  
 • the Greek is, *he shall DO the bullock, as he DID the bul-*  
 • *lock, so shall he DO this*: where DO plainly signifies  
 • *offer*—That the words of the institution, *τοῦτο ποι-*  
 • *ετε, do this*, are to be understood in this sacrificial  
 • sense, is manifest from the command concerning  
 • the cup, which is, *This DO ye, as oft as you drink*  
 • *it, in remembrance of me*. For except we under-  
 • stand the words in such a sense, they will be a plain  
 • tautology

‘tautology—But translate it, as I have shewed the words will very probably bear, *Offer this; make an oblation or libation of this, as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of ME*, and the sense is very good—A priest therefore is necessary and essential to the due administration of this sacrament\*.’—On this reasoning Dr. DODDRIDGE remarks; ‘Because the word ποιεῖν signifies, in some few instances, *to sacrifice*, Dr. BRETT would render it, [ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ] *sacrifice this*; whence he infers, that the eucharist is a *sacrifice*†.’ But though Dr. DODDRIDGE very justly considers the argument of Dr. BRETT as quite inconclusive, I may be permitted to observe; That he has proved the *sacrificial* sense of the term ποιεῖν, in certain connections, by far better evidence than I have ever yet seen produced by our opposers, in favour of that secondary sense of the word βαπτίζειν, on which their constant practice proceeds. The reasoning of Dr. BRETT may therefore teach them the necessity of abiding by the natural and obvious meaning of the term in dispute; for it is impossible, I think, to confute him on any other ground.

Further: To show the impropriety of our Brethren’s conduct, when reasoning on the word before us, we will suppose our Lord to have used the term νίπτω; which in its primary acceptation signifies a partial application of water to a person, by *washing his hands*. Now had this been our Legislator’s commanding term, its native and most common signification would undoubtedly have been pleaded against an immersion of the whole body. But, on the principle of interpretation adopted by our opposers, the argu-

\* *True Script. Account of the Eucharist*, p. 81, 82, 83, 131.

† *Note*, on 1 Cor. xi. 24.



ment might easily have been evaded. For we might have replied; *Νίπτω* is an equivocal, open, general term. It signifies not only to wash the hands, but also the feet and the face. Nay, it is manifestly used to express an entire plunging. For thus it is written, *Every vessel of wood shall be RINSED, υι-Φορεται, in water*, Lev. xvi. 12. Agreeably to which, Mr. PARKHURST says, it signifies in Joh. ix. 7, 11, 15. to wash the whole body; and so SCHWARZIUS understands it. So equivocal is the term, and of such various application, that the Septuagint use it, as MINTERT observes, to express the idea of raining down, or of sending a shower, Job xx. 23 — Again: We will suppose our Lord to have expressed his law in Latin, and that he used the word *perfundo*, instead of the Greek βαπτίζω. We will further suppose that the primary meaning of the Latin verb is pleaded against us. In this case we might have replied, It not only signifies to sprinkle and to pour, but also to bathe: in proof of which we appeal to AINSWORTH, and to the authorities produced by him\*.

We will indulge imagination and suppose on the contrary, that our Lord had caused his law of baptism to be written in modern English; and that, instead of the word βαπτίζω, we had found the term *bathe*, or *dip*; even this would have been liable to similar objections. Our opposers might still have recurred to their old exception, It is an equivocal, open, general term; and signifies to sprinkle, to wet, or bedew, as well as to plunge. In confirmation of which they might have said; 'As to the word *bathe*, it is \* frequently used by our correctest writers and speak-  
\* ers, in such connections where plunging cannot pos-

\* To which may be added, *Virc. Georg. I. 194 Pn. VIII. 589.*

libly be intended. Nothing, for instance, is more common among us than to say, Such an one's cheeks are *bathed* in tears; when we only mean, that the tears trickle plentifully down his cheeks: by which the idea of *sprinkling* is conveyed, rather than that of plunging. To *bathe*, signifies also to supple or soften by the outward application of warm liquors, as Dr. JOHNSON informs us: for which he produces the authority of Mr. DRYDEN, who says; *I'll bathe your wounds in tears for my offence.* Still the word *bathe* is rather in favour of sprinkling than of immersion.—As to the term *dip*, they might have said; 'It is plain the word is often used where a total immersion cannot be designed. So we read that Jonathan *put forth the end of the rod which was in his hand, and DIPT it*, ἐβαψεν αὐτο, *in a honey comb*\*. Again, *Send Lazarus that he may DIP, βαψῇ, the tip of his finger in water*†. It is also common for us to speak of *dipping* a pen in the ink. Sometimes also the word is used allusively, in a sense equally foreign from the idea of an entire immersion. For example, thus; I have just *dipped* into the works of such an author. Now this, far from signifying that I feel my mind as it were *immersed* in the author's writings; only means, as JOHNSON tells us, that I have entered *slightly* into them. Nay, sometimes, when the term *dip* is used with reference to a liquid, it means no more than to *moisten*, to *wet*, as the same celebrated author informs us; who confirms that sense of the word, by appealing to the following lines of our famous English classic, MILTON:

"And tho' not mortal, yet a cold shudd'ring dew  
 "Dips me all o'er, as when the wrath of Jove  
 "Speaks thunder."

\* 1 SAM. xiv. 27. Septuag.

† Luke xvi. 24.

• Evident proofs, they might have added, that the words  
 • *dip* and *bathe*, as well as βαπτω and βαπτίζω, are equi-  
 • vocal, open, general terms; which do not determine  
 • any thing further, than that water should be applied  
 • to the subject in some form or other.—On such prin-  
 ciples, and by such reasonings, the natural and pri-  
 mary meaning of any word, in any law, or in any lan-  
 guage, might be quickly explained away. Were this  
 principle of interpretation universally admitted and  
 applied, no law upon earth could maintain its autho-  
 rity, or obtain its end. The obligation of laws, and  
 obedience to lawgivers, would be little more than  
 empty names. Nor could any doctrine, or any fact,  
 contained in the Bible, stand its ground against the  
 operation of this principle. For by rejecting the na-  
 tural sense of inspired terms, whenever we find it  
 uncompliant with our inclination; and by adopting a  
 secondary, uncommon, or allusive acceptation of them,  
 as often as we find occasion; it is an easy thing for  
 the most ungodly person to manufacture a creed, as  
 well as ritual, entirely to his own liking, out of those  
 materials which the Scripture furnishes, let the real  
 meaning of Prophets and Apostles be what it may.  
 Yes, he must be a dull genius who cannot, by pro-  
 ceeding on this principle, frame a theological system  
 to suit his own taste, in such a manner as to leave but  
 little room for the subjecting of his understanding,  
 his conscience, and his will to divine authority; or  
 so as to have but little occasion for the practice of  
 that selfdenial which is represented by our Lord as a  
 distinguishing mark of true godliness. For, grant but  
 the liberty of taking the principal words of a law, of  
 a narrative, or of a doctrine, in a secondary and re-  
 mote sense, where metaphor and allusion are out of the  
 question; and a person of genius might safely engage to  
 evade

evade any law; to subvert any doctrine, and essentially to misrepresent any fact, contained in the Bible.—My acquaintance, indeed, with languages, ancient or modern, is very contracted; but yet I may venture to conclude, on the ground of analogy, that there are few terms in any language which are not as liable to an improper, allusive, and secondary acceptation, as the word *baptism*. Why, then, in the name of common sense and of common impartiality—why should that emphatical and enacting term βαπτισμω, be singled out as remarkably *equivocal*? Why represented as obscure to such a degree, ‘that the most eminent criticks, commentators and lexicographers are divided in their verdict about’—what? Its *primary* meaning? far from it. Here we think Mr. WILLIAMS is under a gross mistake; for, on the authority of those numerous testimonies which have been laid before the Reader, we may safely assert, that there is hardly any verb in the Greek Testament, about the natural, obvious, primary meaning of which, the most eminent authors appear to be less divided. I do not, indeed, recollect so much as one learned writer, in the whole course of my reading, who denies that the primary sense of the term is to *dip*: and as to the different acceptations for which our opposers plead, we may ask, with Mr. LOCKE, ‘What words are there not used with great latitude, and with some deviation from their strict and proper significations\*?’

The *manner of using* water, when baptism is administered, is a *mere circumstance*, according to Mr. HORSEY: for he compares it with various particulars in the administration of the holy supper, that are entirely circumstantial. This, if I mistake not,

\* *Essay on Human Understanding*, B. II. Chap. xxxii. § 1.

neither agrees with his own principles; with the doctrine of positive institutes, as contained in Scripture and acknowledged by Protestants; nor with common sense.—Not with *his own principles*. For when he baptizes a child, in *what* does he consider the act of baptizing to consist? In taking the infant in his arms? he never imagined it. In pronouncing the solemn form of words? by no means; for then he must consider himself as baptizing the subject without any water at all. In putting his fingers into the water? no such thing; for still no water is applied. In verbal addresses to God for a blessing upon the child, or in exhortations to the parents? far from it; because the same consequence would follow. In what, then, but the *very act* of sprinkling, or of pouring, *in the name of the Father*, and so on? But how can that in which the very act of baptizing consists, be a mere *circumstance* of baptism? Let a man's notions of baptism be what they may, he always considers, and cannot but consider, the act of applying water to a person, or of plunging him into water, not as a *circumstance* of baptism, but as *baptism itself*.—If any of our Pædobaptist Brethren still hesitate, let them ask their own consciences, whether they consider themselves as performing a circumstance no way essential to baptism, when, *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit*, they apply water to a child? The answer, doubtless, will be in the negative. With equal reason, therefore, might Mr. HORSEY have told us, that eating bread and drinking wine at the Lord's table, are circumstances of receiving the sacred supper, or that walking is a circumstance of local motion; as that plunging, pouring, or sprinkling, is a circumstance of baptism: for no minister of Christ can consider his performance

ance of sprinkling, of pouring, or of plunging, in the sublimest of all names, as any thing but the *very act* of baptizing.

Not with the *doctrine of positive institutes*, as contained in Scripture and acknowledged by Protestants. If there be any force or propriety in what our opponent says, it must be on supposition that what he represents as a circumstance, is not enjoined by our divine Lord: for whatever he requires cannot be indifferent, and therefore is not a circumstance. Had the time of day, the number and posture of communicants, or the quality and quantity of bread and wine, been appointed by the great Lawgiver, with reference to his holy supper, not one of those particulars would have been a circumstance: for, it is manifest, they would all have been so many *parts* of one institution; nor would it have been lawful to vary from them. Many particulars of a similar nature were appointed by Jehovah in the ordinance of the ancient passover: but, being appointed, they were of divine obligation, even though the *minutiae* of the institution extended to 'the time of day' when that festival should commence.—The Roman Catholics, like our author in the present case, would fain persuade us, that a participation of wine at the Lord's table is a mere *circumstance*; but they have been constantly told by Protestants, that it is an essential part of the institution: yet not more so, than the use of water in baptism, let 'the mode of use' be whatever it may. Besides, our opponent here begs the question in dispute between us, respecting the term *baptism*.—Again: Omitting various divine appointments which might be mentioned on this occasion, how multifarious were the

rites enjoined for the cleansing of an Israelitish leper, as particularized in Leviticus the fourteenth? They are too numerous to be given in detail; but every reader of the heavenly statute may soon perceive, that according to Mr. HORSEY many of them were such *ceremonial* parts of one positive institute, as may be called *circumstances*: for there is no reason to doubt but the original words there used are as equivocal as the term *baptism*.—As to the avowed *sentiments of Protestants*, relating to the doctrine of positive institutions, I would refer my Reader to the preceding CHAPTER, No. 2, 6, 10, 11, 15, 16, 20. REFLECT. II, III, V, VI, VII.

Not with *common sense*. For if the manner of using water be a *circumstance* of baptism, what in the world can baptism *itself* be? The *circumstances* of a thing are always considered as different from the *thing itself*. They attend, they accompany, or, if you please, they *stand about* a thing; but they are never considered as **THE** thing. I should be glad to know, on these premises, what baptism, real, identical baptism is. It is not *sprinkling* of water; it is not *pouring* of water; nor is it *plunging* into water: for these are only so many modes of using water; and the mode of use is no more of the essence of baptism, than the number of communicants at the Lord's table is of the essence of the sacred supper. Now as, according to Mr. HORSEY, the manner of using water is only a *circumstance* of baptism; as the word βαπτίζω is an equivocal, open, general term; and as, according to Mr. WILLIAMS, the most eminent authors are divided in their verdict about what our Lord meant by it; all we can learn concerning the ordinance is this: Baptism is an *unknown something*, which has a connection

connection with water\*, and was practised by the Apostles in obedience to Jesus Christ; for on the authority of Mr. HORSEY, whether you sprinkle or pour, or plunge, in the name of the eternal Trinity, it is only a *circumstance*, and not *baptism itself*.—Sprinkling, pouring, or plunging, as much a circumstance of baptism, as the *number* of communicants at the holy table is of the sacred supper! One step further, and *baptism itself* (whatever the equivocal word means) will be esteemed a circumstance of something else, and its obligation confined, as by the Quakers, to the ministry of John. Far be it that I should imagine Messrs. WILLIAMS and HORSEY intended to relax the obligation of this positive rite; but whether their manner of speaking has not a tendency so to do, I leave the Reader to judge.

It may, perhaps, be objected; ‘Baptism signifies *washing*; which may be performed by plunging, pouring, or sprinkling; and it is in this view that the different modes of proceeding are called *circumstances*.’ That *washing* is the native, primary, and obvious meaning of the term, we do not believe, nor can we admit, except for the sake of argument. Let it be granted, however, that baptism is no other than washing. What follows? That these three different ways of solemnly using water are mere *circumstances* of washing? nothing less. Because whether one or another of these various modes be adopted, it is *the washing itself*, and not a circumstance of it; or else there is nothing in the whole solemnity that has the least appearance of any such thing. Nor can our op-

\* Mr. HORSEY’s words are, ‘connection with a river;’ but his practice, I presume, is in connection with a basin. See his *Sermon*, p. 19.



posers themselves deny it. For, whether they pour water on the head, or sprinkle the face, it is all the washing they pretend to perform. Consequently, on their own principles, it is not a circumstance; nor can they without absurdity consider it in that light, while they are obliged to acknowledge, that the circumstances of a thing are always different from the thing itself.—That various particulars relating to baptism are merely circumstantial, we readily allow. For instance; The *age* of the candidate; provided he make a credible profession of repentance and faith—The *time* of administration: it may be in the morning, at noon, in the evening, or at midnight, as in the case of the Philippian jailor—The *place*: it may be in a river, a pond, or a baptistery—The *number* of spectators: they may be many or few. These and other things of a similar kind, we look upon as indifferent—as, properly speaking, *circumstances*: because, not being included in the law of baptism, they make no part of the institution. These may greatly vary, while the qualifications of the candidates, the whole form of administration, and the gracious purposes to be answered by the ordinance, are essentially the same. But it is quite otherwise, as to the solemn use of water. For if that be omitted, baptism itself is wanting: if used contrary to divine order and primitive example, the ordinance is corrupted, so corrupted, as not to deserve its original name. See CHAP. I. No. 15, and REFLECT. V. These things being duly regarded, it will appear surprising that so many of our opposers inadvertently speak of immersion, pouring, and sprinkling, as if they were *mere circumstances* of the appointment under dispute: an idea, so contrary to Scripture, to fact, and to common sense,

sense; that it may be considered as the last refuge of a desperate cause.

*Sprinkling, pouring, and plunging, are PERFECTLY EQUIVALENT, EQUALLY VALID,* says Mr. HORSEY. 'Those that are baptized, are either *plunged* into the water, or water is *poured* upon them, or they are *sprinkled* with water: now which soever of these three ways is observed, we ought to believe baptism to be *valid*,' says the COUNCIL OF TRENT\*. If plunging, pouring, and sprinkling, be *equally valid*, it must be because they are *equally enjoined* by divine law. But they are three *different* actions, as before proved, and as all the world will acknowledge, in reference to any other affair. How then shall a single term, understood in its proper and primary sense, *equally* respect three different actions? yet an equal respect they must have from a single term of positive divine law, to render them 'perfectly equivalent, equally valid.' Before Mr. HORSEY pretends to evince, that the word βαπτίζω has this plenitude of signification; we wish him to prove, that any term, in any language, either does or can equally and naturally signify three different actions: A word that has *three* senses, equally proper and natural to it, is indeed equivocal: nor has it, properly speaking, any determinate sense at all. It is a mere term without an idea, and deserves to be banished from the language to which it belongs. See REFLECT. III.—There have been many disputes concerning what is the *proper* and *true* sense of a word; but none, that I have read, about the *number* of true and proper senses which the same word bears, in the same connection. Disputes also have been multiplied,

\* Catechism of Council of Trent. Part II. Of Bap. § 17.

about the *real* meaning of such or such a clause in divine and human law ; but theologians and civilians have seldom taken it into their heads to contend, whether the legislator had *three* meanings, or only *one*, in any enacting clause. It is pleasing, however, for us to reflect, that *plunging* is valid ; for so it is, by the confession of Mr. HORSEY, and by that of the whole Council of Trent, whatever becomes of sprinkling or pouring.—But though Mr. HORSEY assures us, that plunging is perfectly equivalent, equally valid, with pouring or sprinkling ; and though he has done it in emphatical *capitals* ; yet he quickly insinuates, that there is great *severity* in plunging—that it must be often *inconsistent* with the mild genius of the Christian religion—and that it is *harsh, painful, and terrifying*\*. He repents, alas ! he repents of his honest concession. He no sooner grants us the sanction of his opinion, than he resumes it with eagerness, by endeavouring to deprive us of all its authority. But does this worthy author imagine that plunging is valid, independent of divine authority ? Or, that Jesus Christ would exert his authority to sanction a rite that is *inconsistent* with his own religion ? This, I confess, appears to me as incompatible and unaccountable, as our great Legislator having *three* meanings in the same enacting term of his positive law.

*Sprinkling, pouring, and plunging, perfectly equivalent, equally valid !* As, by plunging, Mr. HORSEY means an incision of the whole body ; and as we have no reason to think, that he is for sprinkling or pouring water *all over* the human frame ; so, by his not mentioning any particular part, on which the water should be poured or sprinkled, we are led to con-

\* *Infant Bapt. Stated*, p. 20.

clude, that in his opinion it is quite indifferent on what part the water may fall. Here, then, the administrator<sup>o</sup> has full scope for his inclination to operate; and he may sprinkle any part, from the crown of the head to the soles of the feet, just as his sovereign will directs. How contrary this to the whole analogy of positive divine law in the Old Testament! If Mr. HORSEY be right, the law of baptism is a leaden rule, that will bend and take any form: rather, it is *no* law—it is *no* rule; and with regard to the use of water, every one may do that which seems right in his own eyes. But as it is absurd to suppose, that the primary sense of the same word will equally apply to three different objects; so it must be incongruous for any to imagine, that the same enacting clause or term of a law, can equally require three different actions, and at the same time be completely satisfied with any one of them. Before Mr. HORSEY had inadvertently fixed an imputation of this kind on a positive law of Jesus Christ, he should have well considered, whether the whole history of legislation (sacred, civil, or ecclesiastical) could have furnished him with a single instance of such a fact. That many tyrants and fools have given laws to secular kingdoms, and have even presumed to legislate for Jesus Christ himself, is a fact; that some of their laws have been marked with tyrannical subtilty, and others with egregious folly, is also a fact; but that any of them ever were so crafty, as to contrive a law which, by a single enacting term, equally required *three different acts* of obedience; and yet were so compliant, as to feel themselves perfectly satisfied with having *any one* of those acts performed, I do not believe.

*Vary the mode of administration according to circumstances—Refer the manner of performance to the private*

vate judgment of the person or persons concerned. Strange positions, from the pen of a Protestant Dissenter! How inimical to the grand principle of Non-conformity, and to that of the Reformation! Surely, no law of either God or man was ever so condescending to the will of the subject, as the law of baptism. It is reported, indeed, that those who sit as judges in the court of Inquisition, may interpret the laws against heretics, if there be any thing doubtful in them, according to their own pleasure\*. Nor do I wonder at it. But that a Protestant, and a Protestant Dissenting Brother, should first pronounce the divine law of baptism *obscure*, and then assure us that we may understand and act upon it, with regard to the use of water, *just as we please*, is very amazing! Mr. WILLIAMS, I presume, did not recollect the manner in which our great Legislator introduces the sovereign mandate, nor the words that immediately follow it. ALL AUTHORITY (*ἐξουσία*) is given unto me in heaven and in earth—introduces the law under consideration. Teaching them to OBSERVE ALL THINGS WHATSOEVER I HAVE COMMANDED YOU—are the immediately following words. If ever our Lord expressed himself in the high legislative tone, if ever he spake like one who in earnest demands an implicit and punctual obedience, it was on this occasion. Can it then be supposed, that the Lord Redeemer assumed such an air of divine majesty, and such a stile of divine authority, in giving a law of religious worship, when he *intended* that his followers should administer the rite *just as they pleased*? We may say with CHILLINGWORTH, in another case; ‘He that *can* believe it, let him.’

\* VENERABLE Hist. Eccles. Secul. XIII. § 217.

*Vary the mode of administration according to circumstances—Refer the manner of performance to the private judgment of the administrator, or of the candidate.* Incidental circumstances, then, or the caprice of those concerned, must be the rule of proceeding. On this principle, who can set bounds to that variety of administration which may be lawfully practised? The Council of Trent is of opinion that water should be applied, not to any part of the body, but to the *head*, because it is the seat of sensation\*. Mr CLEVELAND thinks the *face* is the most proper part, because it is always naked†. DEYLINGIUS is confident that sprinkling may be performed, once or thrice, on the *head*, the *forehead*, or the *breast*‡. The Eunomians, it is reported, ‘ baptized only the upper parts of the body as far as the breast: and this they did in a very preposterous way, as EPIPHANIUS relates, *τους ποδας ανω, και την κεφαλην κατω*, with *their heels upwards, and their head downward*. Which sort of men are called *Histopedes*, or *Pedes recti*||.—Now here is variety, great variety; yet Mr. WILLIAMS’s principle will admit of a much larger latitude in the course of baptismal practice. It has indeed no other bounds than the caprice and fancies of men are pleased to affix. They only can say, *Hitherto shalt thou go, and no further*. Were an adult, therefore, or any parent on the behalf of his child, to request of Mr. WILLIAMS an application of baptismal water in any of these ways, he could not refuse without confronting his own principle. Or, were any one to prefer the use of water in imitation

\* *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, Part. II. *Of Sac. of Bap.* § 18.  
 † *Infant Bap. from Heaven*, p. 88. 89. ‡ *De Prudent. Past.* Pars III.  
 Cap. iii. § 25. || BINGHAM’S *Origines Ecclesiast.* B. XI. Chap. xi.  
 § 4.

of the ancient episcopal union; which was applied to the forehead, the eyes, the ears, the nose, the mouth, and the breast; he could not decline it without departing from his own rule\*. Nor could Mr. HORSEY, because it would be an application of water 'in some form or other'; which is all, according to him, that the word βαπτίζω determines: 'the mode of use' being as much a circumstance, as the number of communicants at the Lord's table is of the holy supper.—It is observed by the laborious and learned CHAMIER; 'That no man in his senses will believe that to be the true religion, the law of which is no more fixed and certain, than the rule of conduct contained in these lines:

' *Cum fueris Romæ, Romano vivito more:*

' *Cum fueris alibi, vivito sicut ibi* †.'

But, whatever this great opposer of papal usurpation and superstition might think about a rule of true religion, Messrs. HORSEY and WILLIAMS have given what they consider as a rule of true baptism, which has little more fixedness or certainty in it, than that in the Latin distich, which the learned Frenchman holds in such contempt. For it is plain, that the application 'of water in some form or other,' will readily comply with the custom of any age, or of any country; and referring 'the mode to the private judgment of the persons concerned,' will politely oblige any inclination. This reminds me of what Cardinal CUSANUS affirms. 'The Scripture, says he, is fitted to the time, and variably understood: so that at one time, it is expounded according to the current fashion of the church; and when

\* BINGHAM's *Origines Ecclesiast.* B. XII. Chap. ii. § 2.

† *Panstrut.* Tom. I. L. II. C. xiv. § 9.

that religion is changed, the sense of Scripture is  
 also changed.—No wonder if the practice of the  
 Church do take the Scripture, one time one way,  
 and another time another; for the sense of it keeps  
 pace with the practice\*.—Were these our Dissent-  
 ing Brethren, however, to enter the lists of contro-  
 versy with a sensible Roman Catholic, they would  
 soon find themselves obliged, either to proceed on dif-  
 ferent principles and speak in a different manner, or,  
 in various articles, to give up the Protestant cause.

Were my judgment of the term *baptism* to be  
 formed on those documents which Messrs. HOR-  
 SEY and WILLIAMS have given us, I should be  
 ready to say; It is the strangest and most unac-  
 countable word in the world, when used respecting a  
 divine institution. For though I never heard that  
 learned men were much at a loss to fix its meaning,  
 when found in the Greek classics, in JOSEPHUS, or  
 in ancient ecclesiastical authors; though cold bathing  
 was abundantly practised by many nations in former  
 times; and though, in our own country, it is frequent-  
 ly used by both sexes, for medical purposes and for  
 amusement, without any suspicion of danger or of  
 indecency; yet we no sooner consider the term as  
 making a part of divine law, and as prescribing an  
 act of Christian worship, than all is *darkness*, as to its  
 meaning, and all is *terror*, if considered as enjoining  
 immersion.—If, when used in this connection, you  
 desire to fix its meaning, commentators, critics, and  
 lexicographers are searched in vain. It is a mere  
 Proteus, or a chameleon; for it will assume almost  
 any appearance. In general, however, it is quite

\* In Mr. CLARKSON's *Pract. Divinity of Papists*, p. 39.



complaisant; altering its colour, or shape, just as you please. If you prefer *sprinkling*, it is your devoted servant; and you may sprinkle the head or the breast, the hands or the feet; for it makes no objection. Have you a predilection for *pouring*? still it is at your service: for whether you pour much or little, on the face or the neck, on the fingers or the toes, it will sanction your deed. Are you for *washing*, such washing as cleanses from exterior pollution? you may dip a towel in the basin, instead of your fingers, and apply it to the face or the hands, or to any part of the body you please: for it will be quite satisfied if you do but apply the water *in some form or other*, and you are at your option. Nay, if you happen to be *fond* of water, and to prefer *plunging*, this good-natured word will stamp legality on the act; for plunging is *perfectly equivalent, equally valid*, with pouring and sprinkling. But here, alas! its complaisance takes leave of the plungers. For though it will sturdily defend the *perfect validity* of their practice against every opposer; yet they must shift for themselves as well as they can, if their conduct happen to be suspected of *severity*, of *harshness*, or of any thing *terrifying*. While, therefore, I cannot but admire the versatility of this identical word, *baptism*; I am constrained to lament, that it is not quite so impartial in its regards as one might have imagined; for its beautifully varying aspect is chiefly turned towards our opponents.

Once more: MR. HORSEY is of opinion, that if our Lord had intended to confine his followers to the practice of immersion, he would probably 'have used a word that is decided and limited in its import:' and he thinks that *βυθίζω* or *καταβυθίζω*, *δυνατω*, *καταδυναω* or *καταδύω*, or, finally, *καταποντίζω*, would have been 'indisputably precise and exact,' for such a purpose.

Let

Let us enquire, therefore, into the opinion of lexicographers, concerning the import of these expressions; and we will begin with the famous HENRY STEPHENS. 'Βυθίζω, to cast into a gulf, (the deep, or the sea;) to plunge down: καταβυθίζω signifies the same, and is more commonly used.'—PASOR: (SCHOETTGENII Edit.) 'To plunge down, to cast into the deep. 1 Tim. vi. 9. 2 Maccab. xii. 4. Luke v. 7.'—HEDERICUS: 'To plunge; from βυθός, a whirlpool, a bottomless pit, or the deep. Καταβυθίζω, to cast into a gulf, or the deep, to plunge down; to throw down, to ruin.' See also MINTERT, SCHWARZIUS, LEIGH, and PARKHURST, under the word Βυθίζω.—HEDERICUS: 'Δυκτω, to go under, or into, water; to plunge.'—SCHREVELIUS: 'To go under, or into, water: from which the English terms, *dip*, and *dive*, seem to have been derived.'—H. STEPHENS: 'Καταδυνῶ, or καταδυω, to enter within, or into a more interior place; to enter into a gulf, or the deep.' HEDERICUS: 'To go into a more interior place, to enter into a gulf, or the deep; to hide one's self, to lie hid; to be ashamed, to blush; to plunge down, to plunge under; to fall down; to put on.'—PASOR: 'To plunge, to destroy, to descend; Amos ix. 8. Ezek. xxvi. 13. Exod. xv. 5. Καταδυσις, a descent, a cave in which idolaters worshipped their gods. 1 Kings xv. 13.'—H. STEPHENS: 'Ποντιζω, to plunge into the sea: καταποντιζω is most frequently used, and signifies to plunge down into the sea, to plunge under.'—HEDERICUS: 'To plunge down into the sea, to plunge under. Matt. xviii. 6. Καταποντιστής, is one who plunges others into the sea; a pirate, who, after making his capture, plunges the men under the water.'—SCHWARZIUS: 'To plunge down.'

'down.' See MINTERT, and PARKHURST, under the word, καταποντιζω.—Such, according to these learned authors, are the significations of the words before us: on which I would make the following remarks.

These chosen terms are far from being so univocal and precise in their import, in comparison with the word βαπτίζω, as Mr. HORSEY represents them to be; for several of them have secondary senses, *more distant* from their primary acceptation, than sprinkling is from plunging. This, in a particular manner, is the case with καταδυνω or καταδύω.—The natural sense of δυνω, and a secondary acceptation of others, nearly coincide with the acknowledged primary meaning of βαπτίζω; as the reader may easily observe.—Were these terms perfectly well adapted precisely to express a total immersion, without any disagreeable idea attending it, as our opponent supposes; it might be expected, that one or another of them would have been frequently employed by the Seventy translators, in their version of the Mosaic institutes. But it does not appear, by the Concordance of TROMMIUS, that any one of these verbs is ever used by them, to express those *bathings* which are so frequently mentioned in the Hebrew ritual. No; for as νιπτω is their usual word to enjoin washing the *hands* and the *feet*\*; and as πλυνω is their term for washing of *garments*; so λουω is the verb they use for bathing the *whole body*. Of this, the following passage is a remarkable instance: *Whomsoever he toucheth that hath the issue, (and hath not rinsed, νενοπτει, his hands in water) he shall wash, πλυνει, his clothes, and bathe himself, λου-*

\* Sometimes also the *face*, both in the Seventy and in the New Testament. See Gen. xlii. 31. and Matt. vi. 17.

σεται το σωμα in water \*. Perfectly agreeable to which, is the observation of Dr. DUPORT; 'The grammarians remark a difference between λουειν, and πλυνειν, and νιπτειν; that λουειν is spoken of the whole body, πλυνειν of garments and cloths, and νιπτειν of the hands †.' Λουω & βαπτίζω are used by the Seventy as equivalent. For thus it is written; *Go, and wash, λουσai, in Jordan seven times—Then went he down, and DIPPED himself, εβαπτισατο, seven times in Jordan, according to the saying of the man of God ‡.* As to βυθίζω, καταβυθίζω, and δυπτω, according to, TROMMIUS, they are not so much as once used in the Septuagint: and as to καταδυνω and καταποντιζω, though used by the Seventy, yet in a sense quite foreign to the nature of a positive rite. For instance: *Pharaoh's chariots and his host hath he cast into the sea: his chosen captains also are drowned, (κατεποδησαν; but other copies read, καταποντισεν.) in the Red sea. The depths have covered them: they SANK into the bottom, κατεδυσαν εις βυθον, as a stone §. Why wilt thou SWALLOW UP, καταποντιζεις, the inheritance of the Lord? Far be it, that I should SWALLOW UP, καταποντιω, or destroy ||.* So, in the New Testament, καταποντιζω is used only in the sense of *sinking in the deep, and of drowning.* Thus, for instance, concerning Peter, when walking on the sea: *He was afraid; and beginning to SINK, καταποντιζεσθαι, he cried, saying, Lord save me! It were better for him that a mill-stone were hanged about his neck, and*

\* Lev. xv. 11. See also, verse 5, 8, 13, 21, 22, 27. Chap. xvi. 26, 28. and xvii. 15. Numb. xix. 7, 8, 19. † In Mr. PARKHURST'S *Greek Lexicon*, under the verb Λουω. Vid. ΜΙΝΤΕΡΓ, sub voce Νιπτω. ‡ 2 Kings v. 10, 14. § Exod. xv. 4. 5. || 2 Sam. xx. 19, 20. See Ps. lv. 9. Septuag. liv. 9. Lament. ii. 2, 5. and many other places.

that he were drowned, καταποντισθῆναι, in the depth of the sea\*. Βυθίζω is used likewise in the Apocrypha, and in the New Testament, for *sinking in the deep*, and for *drowning*. Thus an apocryphal author : *When they were gone forth into the deep, they DROWNED*, ἐβυθίσαν, *no less than two hundred of them*†. Thus an Evangelist: *They came and filled both the ships, so that they began to SINK*, βυθίζεσθαι αὐτὰ‡. Thus the Apostle Paul: *They that will be rich, fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which DROWN*, βυθίζουσι, *men in destruction and perdition*§. And thus CLEMENS ROMANUS: ‘Pharaoh and his host, and all the rulers of Egypt—were drowned, ἐβυθίσθησαν, in the bottom of the Red sea, and perished||. Hence it appears, that all those Greek verbs which are selected by Mr. HORSEY, except δυνῶ, manifestly convey the idea of danger, of injury, or of destruction to the subject upon which an agent performs the action that is naturally expressed by them: yet of these terms he thinks it probable that our Lord would have chosen one or another, had he designed to confine his followers to the practice of immersion! As if no word could be decidedly for *dipping*, if it did not, in its primary acceptation, denote *sinking in the deep*, or *drowning*! With much greater critical propriety might he have mentioned λουω, than any of the words proposed; because that is the verb which, above all others, the Seventy translators adopted, to signify the bathing of *the whole body*. Yet here, alas! the old exception would have recurred: for λουω signifies to *wash*, and washing, they would have said, may be performed by pouring or sprinkling.—From

\* Matt. xiv. 30; and xviii. 6.  
v. 7.

§ 1 Tim. vi. 9.

† 2 Maccab. xii. 4.

‡ Epist. ad Corinth. § 51.

‡ Luke

what the learned assert, concerning the native and obvious acceptation of βαπτίζω, ἐκχέω, βεπτίζω, and most of the terms Mr. HORSEY has mentioned; there seems to be much the same difference between them, as there is between *sprinkling, pouring, dipping, and drowning*, in our own language.

But what would Mr. HORSEY and others have said, had any of his chosen terms, except δυνταω, been used by our Lord to express that immersion about which we contend? They would soon, I suppose, have exclaimed; ‘What, will nothing satisfy our opposers, but plunging a candidate for the appointed rite into a gulf, or the sea! Nothing short of what will put life itself into the most imminent danger! Must we always go to the sea, or to some abyss of water, to administer the ordinance! Severe, harsh, terrifying! The very thought shocks our feelings and plunges us in horror. Impossible, that the law of our gracious and condescending Lord should be rightly understood by these dismal and cruel plungers. It must have another meaning; for common sense requires it.’—Here a secondary and remote acceptation of the word in question (suppose καταδυναω, or καταδυω,) would have been sought. In which case, two copies of the Septuagint version of Psalm cxix. 136. would have furnished them with an instance much to their purpose: for there the word καταδυσαν is used to express *a copious flow and full of tears*; which might have been very happily applied to prove, that the term, among other acceptations, means *to sprinkle*\*. Nay, they might have pleaded the use of the word by the author of the Apostolical Constitutions, **BAZIL the Great, CHRYSOSTOM, THEOPHYLACT, DA-**

\* See Bos's *Septuagint*.

MASCENE, and other ecclesiastical Greek writers, as tantamount to the term βαπτίζω\*. For, as no one doubts but they had a tolerable acquaintance with their own language; as nobody dreams of their administering baptism, by plunging people into the depths of the sea; and as Mr. HORSEY thinks he has proved that the word baptize signifies to sprinkle; so it follows by an easy consequence, that the verb καταδυνω, stubborn and terrifying as it may appear, would have been quite as pliable and obliging to our opponents as the term βαπτίζω. There is reason to think, however, that it would be a much easier task for any one to prove, that βαπτίζω signifies in certain connections, *to sink in the deep, or to drown and destroy*; than that it is ever used by Greek authors to express the idea of pouring or of sprinkling *a few drops of water* on the head or the face. See No. 52, 55, 64, and the Note subjoined to No. 82. Agreeable to which is the language of DAMASCENE, and of TERTULLIAN. By the former, Noah's flood is called a *baptism*; and by the latter, *the baptism of the world*†.

Mr. HORSEY, when pleading the want of a word more decidedly expressive of plunging than βαπτίζω is, reminds me of an evasion sometimes used by Arian subscribers to the Thirty Nine Articles of the English Church. 'Had the compilers, or imposers, they say, intended to have been more determinate upon any point, they ought to have been *more explicit and particular*‡.' Now, as it is not so much a want of precision in the Articles and Liturgy of the National Establishment which occasioned this excep-

\* See No. 1. of this CHAP. SUICERI *Thesaur. Eccles.* sub voce, *Αναδυω*; and SPANHEMII *Dub. Evang.* Pars III. Dub. xxiv. p. 70.

† Apud SUICERUM, *Thesaur. Eccles.* Tom. I. l. 623. ‡ In Dr. WATERLAND'S *Supplem. to Case of Arian Subscrip.* p. 34.

tion, as a dislike to the doctrines they contain; so I suspect, that it is not so much a defect of *meaning* in the word βαπτίζω, to signify immersion, as a disapprobation of that *very immersion*, which was the reason of our opponent's remark. It may, on our part, with reason be asked; If our Lord intended, and if the Apostles practised pouring or sprinkling, why was not such or such a word used, which in its *obvious* and *primary* acceptation signifies to pour or to sprinkle? But it is quite foreign to the purpose, and proves nothing so much as the want of better arguments, to think of another word to express the idea of immersion, when that is the radical and obvious meaning of the term βαπτίζω. The following observation of Mr. ALSOP will therefore apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to the case before us. 'If λυτρον, αντιλυτρον, and αντιλυτρον ὑπερ, will not evince a *proper price* paid by way of ransom for another, we must despair of ever expressing truth with that clearness, but it shall be liable to misconstruction, by the possibility of another meaning: and it is in vain to seek a remedy against that evil for which there is no help in nature \*.'

REFLECT. X. Before I conclude this Chapter, I will present the Reader with a pertinent quotation from Dr. WATERLAND. 'In all manner of controversy which depends upon interpretation of dead writings, he that undertakes to prove a point, or to establish a doctrine, lies under this disadvantage; That, as long as there appears any *possibility* of a different interpretation, an adversary may still demur and demand farther evidence. Now, considering the great latitude and ambiguity of words and phrases, in all

\* *Intif.zzo.* p. 644.



\* languages, (if a man would search into all the senses they are possibly capable of) and that even the most full and *express* may be often eluded by having recourse to tropes and figures, or to some other artificial turn of wit or criticism; I say, considering this, there may be always something or other plausibly urged against any thing almost whatever\*.—Now though every person of reading and observation must acknowledge this remark to be just, yet we may venture to affirm, That if the preceding authorities produced from the Quakers, whose hypothesis is not affected by any particular sense of the term in dispute—from the most learned Pædobaptists themselves, whose cause is deeply interested in the meaning of the word—and, by some of our opposers, from Greek authors†, do not sufficiently warrant our sense of the word under consideration; we may justly challenge our Brethren to fix, and authenticate the meaning of any expression in the original Scriptures, against any opponent whatever. Nay, if the term baptism do not determinately signify that the ordinance should be administered by immersing the subject in water; we should be glad of information what other expression *could* have conveyed that idea, without being liable to similar exceptions with those against which we now contend. It may therefore be safely concluded, that if there be nothing in the design of the ordinance, nor in the apostolic practice, inconsistent with the notion of dipping; we do not deserve reproach for insisting, that *baptism* and *immersion* are terms equivalent.

\* *Eight Sermons*, Pref. p. 4, 5. Edit. 2d. † To the authorities produced from Greek authors, No. 31. 45. 52. 55. 64. and 82. a multitude of others might have been added; as the reader may see by consulting Dr. GALL's *Reflections upon Dr. WALL's Hist. of Inf. Bapt.* Lect. III.

## • CHAPTER III.

*The Design of Baptism; Or the Facts and Blessings represented by it, both in regard to our Lord and his Disciples.*

**W**ITSIUS: "Our Lord would be baptized, that he might conciliate authority to the baptism of John; that he might manifest himself to be equally the head of those who are baptized, as of those who are circumcised; that he has communion with both, and came that of both he might make one: that by his own example, he might commend and sanctify our baptism, equally as other sacraments to which he submitted; that men might not be loth to come to the baptism of the LORD, seeing the Lord was not backward to come to the baptism of a servant: that by his baptism, he might represent the future condition both of himself and his followers; first humble, then glorious; now mean and low, then glorious and exalted; *that* represented by immersion, *this* by emersion: that by the use of this sacrament, the promises of the covenant which was between himself and the Father, might be confirmed to him, concerning the entire expiation of those offences which he took on himself, the justification and sanctification of those persons whom he represented, and concerning a glorious resurrection, by which he should soon emerge out of the waters of tribulation, Psalm cx. 7: and, finally, to declare, by his voluntary submission to baptism, that he would not delay the delivering up of himself to be immersed in the torrents of hell, yet with a certain faith and

II 2

hope

hope of emerging—Immersion into the water is to be considered by us, as exhibiting that dreadful abyss of divine justice, in which Christ for our sins, which he took on himself, was for a time as it were absorbed; as in David, his type, he complains, Psalm lxix. 3. More particularly, seeing such an immersion deprives a person of light, and of other things pertaining to this world, it excellently represents the death of Christ, while his continuance under water, however short, denotes the burial of Christ, and the lowest degree of his humiliation; when, being laid in a sepulchre that was sealed and guarded by the Roman soldiers, he was considered as entirely cut off. Emergence out of the water, exhibits an image of his resurrection, or of the victory which, being dead, he obtained over death in his own dark domains, that is, the grave. All these things the Apostle intimates, Rom. vi. 3, 4. Besides, baptism also represents those *benefits*, both present and future, which believers obtain in Christ. Among the present benefits, the principal is, communion with the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ; and, which is consequent upon it, the mortification and burial of our old, and resurrection of the new man, in virtue of the blood and Spirit of Christ. For immersion into the water, represents the death of the old man, in such a manner as shows that he can neither stand in judgment to our condemnation, nor exercise dominion in our bodies, that we should obey his lusts. In respect of the former, the death of the old man pertains to our justification; in regard to the latter, it belongs to our sanctification. The continuance under the water, represents the burial of the body of sin, by which all hope of its revival is cut off; so that it shall never be able afterwards, either to condemn the elect,

elect, or to reign over them." *Miscel. Sac.* Tom. II. Exercit. xv. § 63. *Œcon. Fœd.* L. IV. C. xvi. § 25—29.

2. Dr. ROBERT NEWTON: "Baptism was usually performed by immersion, or dipping the whole body under water, to represent the death and burial and resurrection of Christ together; and therewith to signify the person's own dying to sin, the destruction of its power, and his resurrection to new life. St. Paul plainly refers to this custom, Rom. vi. 4." *Pract. Expofit. of Catechifm*, p. 297, 298.

3. A. II. FRANKIUS: "The baptism of Christ represented his sufferings, Matt. xx. 22. and his coming up out of the water, his resurrection from the dead." *Programmata*, Program. xiv. p. 343, 344.

4. Mr. RICH. BAXTER: "In our baptism, we are dipped under the water, as signifying our covenant profession, that as he was buried for sin, we are dead and buried to sin.—They [your lusts] are dead and buried with him, for so your baptism signifieth; in which you are put under the water, to signify and profess, that your old man is dead and buried.—We are raised to holiness by his Spirit, as we rise out of the water in baptism—Col. ii. 11, 12, 13. where note,—that the putting of the body under the water did signify our burial with Christ, and the death, or putting off of our sins. And though we now use a less quantity of water, yet it is to signify the same thing, or else we should destroy the being of the sacrament: so also our rising out of the water signifieth our rising and being quickened together with him. Note also, that it is not only an engagement to this *hereafter*, but a thing presently done. They were in baptism buried with Christ; and put off the body of sin, and were quickened with him: and this doth all suppose their *own present* profession to put off the body

of sin; and their consent to be baptized on these terms."

*Paraphrase on the New Test.* at Rom. vi. 4. Col. ii.

12. 1 Pet. iii. 21. *Disput. of Right to Sacram.* p. 58.

5. M. SAURIN: "Paul says, *We are buried with him by baptism into death*; that is, the ceremony of wholly immersing us in water, when we were baptized, signified, that we died to sin; and that of raising us again from our immersion signified, that we would no more return to those disorderly practices, in which we lived before our conversion to Christianity." *Sermons*, Vol. III. p. 171. Mr. ROBINSON's *Translation*.

6. Dr. T. GOODWIN: "The eminent thing signified and represented in baptism, is, not simply the blood of Christ, as it *washeth* us from sin; but there is a further representation therein of Christ's death, burial, and resurrection, in the baptized's being first buried under water, and then rising out of it; and this is not in a bare conformity unto Christ, but in a representation of a communion with Christ, in that his death and resurrection. Therefore it is said, *We are BURIED with him in baptism*; and, *Wherein you are RISEN with him*. It is not simply said, *like as* he was buried and rose; but *with him*. So as our communion and oneness with him in his resurrection, is represented to us therein, and not only our conformity or likeness unto him therein. And so baptism representeth this to us, that Christ having once in himself sustained the persons of all the elect, in his burial and resurrection; that now, upon the party himself who is baptized, is personally, particularly, and apparently reacted the same part again in his baptism; thereby showing what his communion with Christ before was, in what was then done to Christ; that he then was buried with Christ, and rose with him; and upon that ground is now, in this outward sign of baptism, (as in a show, or representation) both buried and also riseth

[CHAP. III.] - Blessings represented by 184  
 riseth again." *Christ set forth*, SERMON III. Chap. vii.  
 p. 82, 83.

7. TURRETTINUS: "The passage of the Israelites through the Red sea, wonderfully agrees with our baptism, and represents the grace it was designed to express. For as, in baptism, when performed in the primitive manner, by immersion and emersion, descending into the water, and again going out of it, of which descent and ascent we have an example in the Eunuch, Acts viii. 38, 39: yea, and what is more, as by this rite, when persons are immersed in water, they are overwhelmed, and as it were buried, and in a manner buried *together with Christ*; and again, when they emerge, seem to be raised out of the grave, and are said to rise again with Christ, Rom. vi. 4, 5. Col. ii. 12: so, in the Mosaic baptism, we have an immersion, and an emersion; that, when they descended into the depths of the sea; this, when they went out and came to the opposite shore. The former, was an image of death; the latter, of a resurrection. For, passing through the bottom of the sea, were they not near to death? And escaping to the opposite shore, were they not as if revived from the dead?—As in former times, the persons to be baptized were immersed in the water, continued under the water, and emerged out of it, Matt. iii. 16. Acts viii. 38; so the old man died in them and was buried, and the new man arose, Rom. vi. 4. Col. ii. 12. As now, persons to be baptized, are sprinkled with water; so they are sprinkled with the blood and Spirit of Christ, to the washing away of sin, Acts xxii. 16. Ephes. v. 26, 27. Heb. ix. 14\*." *Disputat. de Bapt.*  
*Nubis*

\* ' I should think that man's reasoning very weak, says Mr.  
 ' BRADBURY, who would pretend to prove sprinkling from [those  
 words,]

*Nubis et Maris*. 24. *Institut. Theolog.* Tom. III. Loc. XIX. Quæst. xi. § 14.

8. Bp. PATRICK: "They [the primitive Christians] put off their old clothes, and stript themselves of their garments; then they were immersed all over, and buried in the water, which notably signified the *putting off the body of the sins of the flesh*, as the Apostle speaks, and their entering into a state of death or mortification after the similitude of Christ; according to the same Apostle's language elsewhere, *We are baptized into his death—We are buried with him in baptism*—Though we by going into the water profess that we are willing to take up the cross and die for Christ's sake; yet, on God's part, this action of going into and coming out of the water again, did signify that he would bring such persons to live again," at the general resurrection. *Discourse of the Lord's Supper*, p. 421, 422, 436. Edit. 5th.

9. Mr. POLHILL: "Where baptism is in the right use, there is a seal of union with Christ—They have the power of his death in mortification, and the power of his resurrection in a divine life: the one, is notably adumbrated in the baptismal immersion into the water; the other, in the eduction out of it." *Mystical Union*, Chap. VII. p. 202, 203.

10. Mr. SCUDDER: "Baptism—doth lively represent the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, together with your crucifying the affections and lusts; being dead and buried with him unto sin, and rising with him to newness of life, and to hope of glory. Rom. vi. 3, 4, 5. Col. ii. 11, 12, 13." *Daily Walk*, Chap. V. p. 95.

\* words.] your hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience. This is mere jingling upon words.' *Duty and Devil of Bap.* p. 158.

11. GERHARDUS: "As plunging may signify that we are baptized with Christ into his death, Rom. vi. 3; and that our old man is drowned in baptism, Rom. vi. 6; so aspersion may signify that we are sprinkled in baptism with the blood of Christ, and cleansed from all sin. 1 Pet. i. 2. 1 Joh. i. 8." *Loci Theolog.* Tom. IV. De Circumcis. § 96.

12. BOTSACCUS: "Baptism is a sepulchre: *We are buried with Christ, by baptism into death.* Rom. vi. 4." *Promptuarium Allegoriarum*, § 1295.

13. Mr. MARSHALL: "Baptism signifieth the application of Christ's resurrection to us, as well as his death; we are raised up with him in it to newness of life, as well as buried with him. Rom. vi. 4, 5, 10, 11." *Gospel Mystery of Sanct.* Direct. III. p. 50.

14. Mr. ALEXANDER ROSS: "Immersion into the water represents to us the death and burial of Christ, and therefore our mortification: likewise the very emersion out of the purifying water, is a shadow of the resurrection of Christ, and of our spiritual quickening." *Annotat. in WOLLEBII Compend. Theolog.* L. I. C. xxiii. p. 150.

15. CHAMIERUS: "They who are baptized represent the death of Christ, and at the same time their own. Rom. vi. 3, 4." *Panstrat.* Tom. III. L. XXVI. C. xix. § 12.

16. BUDDEUS: "Immersion, which was used in former times, was a symbol and an image of the death and burial of Christ; and at the same time it informs us, that the remains of sin, which are called the *old man*, should be mortified." *Dogmat. Theolog.* L. V. C. i. § 8.

17. Dr. WHITBY: "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism, plunging us under the water,



into a conformity with his death, which put his body under the earth; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead, by the glorious power of the Father, even so we also, thus dead in baptism, should rise with him, and walk in newness of life." *Paraphrase on Rom. vi. 4.*

18. Bp. HALL: "Ye are, in baptism, buried together with Christ, in respect of the mortification of your sins, represented by lying under the water; and in the same baptism, ye rise up with him in newness of life, represented by your rising up out of the water again; through that faith of yours which is grounded upon the mighty power of God, who hath raised him from the dead." *Hard Texts, on Col. ii. 12.* Edit. 1633.

19. PICTETUS: "That immersion into, and emergence out of the water, practised by the ancients, signify the death of the old, and the resurrection of the new man, Rom. vi. Col. ii." *Theolog. Christ. L. XIV. C. iv. § 13.*

20. Bp. DAVENANT: "In baptism, the burial of the body of sin, or of the old Adam, is represented, when the person to be baptized is put down into the water; as a resurrection, when he is brought out of it." *Expos. Epist. ad Coloss. in Cap. ii. 12.*

21. Dr. BOYS: "The dipping in holy baptism has three parts; the putting into the water, the continuance in the water, and the coming out of the water. The putting into the water, doth ratify the mortification of sin by the power of Christ's death, as Paul, Rom. vi. 3. *Know ye not that all we which have been baptized into Jesus Christ, have been baptized into his death, and that our old man is crucified with him?* The continuance in the water, notes the burial of sin; to wit, a continual increase of mortification

fication by the power of Christ's death and burial, Rom. vi. 4. The coming out of the water, figured our spiritual resurrection and vivification to newness of life, by the power of Christ's resurrection, Rom. vi. 4. Col. ii. 12." *Works*, p. 294. Edit. 1629.

22. MASTRICHT: "As in the baptismal washing, especially when performed by immersion, we are plunged in water, abide in it a little while, and then emerge; so Christ was immersed for us in death, continued under its dominion the space of three days, and then emerged by his resurrection—As in the baptismal washing, especially when performed by immersion, we are planted in water; so we are planted both in the blood and body of Christ, when we are baptized into his mystical body, 1 Cor. xii. 13: and as we, in a manner, put on water, so also do we put on Christ, Gal. iii. 27. Again; As Christ, by that baptism of his own blood, Matt. xx. 22. died, was buried, and rose again; so we are planted in him, spiritually die with him to sin, are buried and rise again, Rom. vi. 3—6. Col. ii. 11, 12, 13. Further; As by water the body is cleansed, 1 Pet. iii. 21; so by the blood and Spirit of Christ the soul is purified, 1 John i. 7. Finally; As in baptism we emerge out of a sepulchre of water, and pass, as it were, into a new life; so also being delivered from every kind of death, we shall be saved to eternal life, Mark xvi. 16." *Theoret. Pract. Theolog.* L. VII. C. iv. § 10.

23. GROTIUS: "*Buried with him by baptism.* Not only the word *baptism*, but the very *form* of it, intimates this. For an immersion of the whole body in water, so that it is no longer beheld, bears an image of that burial which is given to the dead. So Col. ii. 12—There was in baptism, as administered in former times, an image both of a burial and of a resurrection:

which, in respect of Christ, was external; in regard to Christians, internal, Rom. vi. 4." In Rom. vi. 4. Col. ii. 12.

24. MR. BURKITT: "We are buried with him by baptism into death. The Apostle alludes, no doubt, to the ancient manner and way of baptizing persons in those hot countries, which was by immersion, or putting them under water for a time and then raising them up again out of the water, which rite had also a mystical signification, representing the burial of our old man, sin in us, and our resurrection to newness of life." *Expos. Notes*, on Rom. vi.

25. VITRINGA: "To be immersed in water, and to be under water, represent the death and burial of our old man, in virtue of the death of Christ. To be washed with water, denotes our being justified and sanctified. To emerge out of the water, signifies our being saved from death, in virtue of Christ's death; our being regenerated to a lively hope and our being raised again to a new life, that shall never cease." *Aphorismi Sancti Theologi Aphor.* 801

26. CONFESSIO OF SUFFERING "As touching baptism we confess, that which the Scripture doth in divers places teach thereof, That we by it are buried into the death of Christ, made one body, and do put on Christ." Chapter xvii. in *Harmony of Confess.* p. 410. Cambridge, 1586.

27. BUCANUS: Our Lord was baptized of John to signify that he was sent to be baptized, that is, plunged in death; and that he might wash away our sins with his own blood—Immersion into water, or aspersion, plainly denotes the sprinkling of the blood of Christ for the remission of sins, and the imputation of righteousness: and the continuance under water, however short, the death and burial of our native

nat. corruption, (in virtue of our Lord's death and burial) it is, the mortification of the old Adam, which is the first part of our regeneration; but emergence, the rising of the new man, or quickening and renewals of life; and so, analogically, our future resurrection is, as it were, presented to view. Rom. vi. 3, 4. and iv. 17." *Institut. Theolog. Loc. xlvii. p. 601. 631.*

28. ZEPHYRUS: "Baptism is a sign of the mortification and burial of the old man—For immersion into the water, which was used of old, represented this mortification, death, and burial; in which immersion, as it were, under the water, when baptized. I speak agreeably to the ancient practice of the church. The Apostle, therefore, says; *We are crucified with Christ and buried, by baptism into death.*" Rom. vi. p. 437, 438."

29. ILLUSTRIUS: "Baptism is a figure and mark of our original burial. For by that immersion into water, a continuance under the water which represent a burial, baptiz'd persons express their being buried to sin." *Comment. in Epist. ad Rom. ad Cap. vi. 4.*

30. CASTALIO: "*Else what shall they do who are baptized for the dead?*"—That you may understand this place of Paul, consider the manner and nature of baptism, as described, Rom. vi. in these words: *As many of us as have been baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death.* And a little after, *For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection.* This, therefore, is the argument of Paul; When Christians are baptized, they are baptized for this purpose, that they may die with Christ, and then rise again." *In 1 Cor. xv. 29.*

31. SCHOETTGENIUS: "The Apostle forms a comparison between baptism and death. He that is baptized, is entirely under water, and no longer seems to live. When, therefore, we Christians are baptized, it is into the death of Christ; namely, that we should become imitators of his death. Baptism obligeth us to become like our Lord in his death and resurrection." *Horæ Hebraicæ*, ad Rom. vi. 4. p. 515.

32. HOORNBEEKIUS: "The Apostle speaking of what was notorious and certain, says; *Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death?* Rom. vi. 3. referring to what is performed in baptism; namely, the entrance into water, and the going out of it. For he immediately adds; *Therefore, we are buried with him by baptism.* And, Col. ii. 12. *Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him.* As, in respect of Christ, his death was followed by his resurrection from the dead; so our conformity to him consists in dying and rising again with him. This is clearly presented to our view and sealed, by that immersion and emersion which are in baptism." *Theolog. Pract.* L. IX. C. xxii. Tom. II. p. 388.

33. TILLENUS: "The ceremony in baptism is three-fold: immersion into the water, a continuance under the water, and a rising out of the water—The internal and essential form of baptism is no other than that analogical proportion of the signs, already explained, with the things signified. For as it is a property of water to wash away the filth of the body; so it represents the power of Christ's blood in the cleansing from sin. Thus immersion into the water declares, by the most agreeable analogy, the mortification of the old man; and emersion out of the water,

ter, the vivification of the new man—The same plunging into the water exhibits to our view that dreadful abyss of divine justice, in which Christ, on account of our sins, was for a time in a manner swallowed up. Abiding under the water, however short the time, denotes his descent to hell; that is, as we have elsewhere declared, the lowest degree of abasement, when, in a sealed and guarded sepulchre, he was considered as one entirely cut off. Emergence out of the water, presents us with an image of that victory, which he, though dead, obtained over death, even in his own pavilion; that is, the sepulchre. Thus, therefore, it is right that we who are *baptized into his death*, and buried with him, should also rise again with him, and walk in newness of life. Rom. vi. 3, 4. Col. ii. 12." *Syntag. Disputat. Pars II. Disp. xli. § 15, 32, 34.*

34. STAPFERUS: "The Apostle explains the sacrament of baptism, by communion with the death and resurrection of Christ, Rom. vi. 3, 4. Col. ii. 12." *Institut. Theolog. Polem. Tom. I. Cap. iii. § 1638.*

35. BURMANNUS: "The external rite, in baptism, having the image, as well of overwhelming and suffocation, as of washing, bears also a twofold figure: and it signifies, partly, the death and burial of Christ, and our communion with them;—partly, the washing away of sin, by the blood and Spirit of Christ; or the justification and sanctification of a sinner. Rom. vi. 4. 1 Pet. iii. 20. Acts ii. 38. Tit. iii. 5." *Synops. Theolog. Tom. II. Loc. XLIII. C. viii. § 3.*

36. ROELL: "The signification of baptism is taught, Rom. vi. namely, that it is a sign and seal of the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, and of  
our

our communion with them. For he that is immersed in water, which has the power of suffocating, is considered as in a state of death; and likewise, as long as he continues immersed, he is there buried. But when he rises out of the water, he rises, as it were, from a state of death, and begins to live afresh. Of what kind this newness of life is, baptism also at the same time distinctly represents. For as water has the power of washing and purifying, it signifies that, in virtue of our Lord's death, the person baptized is cleansed from sin, and that he ought to live a new and a pure life without the pollution of sin—When persons are baptized in faith, they are *buried with Christ*; to signify that they are no longer under the curse. They rise with Christ, or rather they are raised; as they that are baptized, after immersion into water, rise again out of the water, when they repent and so rise again from a death in sin. Thus also they rise again to a new life and are quickened: they live with Christ here in grace, and shall for ever live in glory." *Explicat. Epist. ad Ephes. in Cap. iv. 5. Exegesis Epist. ad Coloss. in Cap. ii. 13.*

37. LAMPE: "Water, in the sacrament of baptism, represents the passive obedience and death of Christ, and the communion of believers with them." *Prolegom. in Joan. L. I. C. ii. § 23.*

38. Abp. LEIGHTON: "That baptism doth apply and seal to the believer his interest in the death and resurrection of Christ, the Apostle St. Paul teaches to the full, Rom. vi. 4. *We are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.* Where the dipping to the water is referred to, as representing our dying with Christ; and the return thence, as expressive

five

five of our rising with him." *Comment* upon 1 Pet. iii. 21.

39. BRAUNIUS: "By baptism we are plunged under the water, and as it were buried; but we do not continue in a state of death, for we immediately rise again from thence: to signify that we, through the merits of Christ, and with Christ, mortify the old man, are buried with Christ, and with him arise to newness of life. *We are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised from the dead, to the glory of the Father, so we also should walk in newness of life,* Rom. vi. 4, 5." *Doct. Fœd. Pars IV. Cap. xxi. § 11.*

40. Dr. MANTON: "*We are buried with him in baptism into his death*: the like expression you have, Col. ii. 12. *Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him.* The putting the baptized person into the water, denoteth and proclaimeth the burial of Christ, and we by submitting to it are baptized [buried] with him, or profess to be dead to sin; for none but the dead are buried. So that it signifieth Christ's death for sin, and our dying unto sin." *Sermon, on Rom. vi. 4.*

41. CHURCH OF ENGLAND: "As we be buried with Christ by our baptism into death, so let us daily die to sin, mortifying and killing the evil motions thereof. And as Christ was raised up from death by the glory of the Father, so let us rise to a new life, and walk continually therein." *Homily of the Resurrect.*

42. H. ALTINGIUS: "As in ancient times the persons to be baptized were immersed into water, continued under water, and emerged out of the water, Matt. iii. 16. Acts viii. 38; so the old man in them died and was buried, and the new man rose again,  
Rom.



Rom. vi. 4. Col. ii. 12. As; now, the persons to be baptized are sprinkled with water, so they are sprinkled with the blood and Spirit of Christ, to the washing away of sin, Acts xxii. 16. Ephes. v. 25, 26. Heb. ix. 14." *Loci Commun.* Pars I. Loc. XII. p. 200. *Explicat. Catechis. Palat.* Pars II. Quæst. lxix. p. 311, 312.

43. WOLFIUS: "Immersion into water, in former times, and a short continuance under the water, practised by the ancient church, afforded the representation of a burial in baptism." *Curæ, ad Rom.* vii. 4.

44. G. J. VOSSIUS: "In our baptism, by a continuance under water, the burial of the body of sin, or the old Adam, is represented. The similitude consists in this: That as a corpse is overwhelmed and pressed by the earth; so, in baptism, a man is overwhelmed with water; and as a man is pressed with water, so the power of sin should be pressed in us and enervated, that it may no longer drive us whither it pleases, or hinder our salvation." *Disputat. de Bap.* Disp. III. Thef. 4.

45. Dr. CAVE: "As in immersion there are in a manner three several acts, the putting the person into water, his abiding there for a little time, and his rising up again; so by these were represented Christ's death, burial, and resurrection; and in conformity therunto, our dying unto sin, the destruction of its power, and our resurrection to a new course of life. By the person's being put into water, was lively represented the putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, and being washed from the filth and pollution of them. By his abode under it, which was a kind of burial in the water, his entering into a new state of death for mortification, like as Christ remained for  
some

some time under the state or power of death. Therefore, as many as are baptized into Christ, are said to be baptized into his death, and to be buried with him by baptism into death; that the old man being crucified with him, the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth he might not serve sin; for that he that is dead is freed from sin, as the Apostle clearly explains the meaning of this rite. And then by his emersion, or rising up out of the water, was signified his entering upon a new course of life, differing from that he lived before; that like as Christ was raised up by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." *Primitive Christianity*, Part I. Chap. x. p. 204. Edit. 6th.

46. LUTHER: "That the minister dippeth a child into the water, signifieth death; that he again bringeth him out of it, signifieth life. So Paul explains it, Rom. vi.—Being moved by this reason, I would have those that are to be baptized, to be entirely immersed, as the word imports and the mystery signifies." In Dr. DU VEIL, on Acts viii. 38. Vid. LUTHER *Catechis. Minor*.

47. Bp. FOWLER: "Christians being plunged into the water in baptism, signifies their obliging themselves, in a spiritual sense, to die and be buried with Jesus Christ (which death and burial consist, in an utter renouncing and forsaking of all their sins) that so, answerably to his resurrection, they may live a holy and godly life." *Design of Christianity*, Sect. I. Chap. viii. p. 79, Edit. 4th.

48. Dr. SAM. CLARKE: "*We are buried with Christ by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life*, Rom. vi. 4. In the primitive times, the manner of baptizing

tizing was by immersion, or dipping the whole body into the water. And this manner of doing it, was a very significant emblem of the dying and rising again, referred to by St. Paul, in the abovementioned similitude." *Exposition of the Church Catechism*, p. 294. Edit. 6th.

49. CAJETAN: "*We are buried with him by baptism into death.* By our burying he declares our death, from the ceremony of baptism: because he who is baptized, is put under the water, and by this bears a likeness of him that is buried, who is put under the earth. Now because none are buried but dead men, from this very thing that we are buried in baptism, we are assimilated to Christ when he was buried." In Mr. HENRY LAURENCE'S *Treatise of Bap.* p. 71, 72.

50. CORNELIUS A LAPIDE: "We are baptized into a similitude of the death of Christ. For they who are put under the water, allegorically represent Christ dead and buried." In Mr. HEN. LAURENCE'S *Treatise of Bap.* p. 73, 74.

51. Dr. HAMMOND: "'Tis a thing that every Christian knows, that the immersion in baptism refers to the death of Christ; the putting the person into the water, denotes and proclaims the death and burial of Christ." *On Rom. vi.* 3.

52. Bp. NICHOLSON: "The ancient manner in baptism, the putting of the person baptized under the water, and then taking him out again, did well set forth these two acts; the first his dying, the second his rising again—Into the grave with Christ, we went not; for our bodies were not, nor could be buried with his: but in our baptism, by a kind of analogy or resemblance, while our bodies are under the water, we may  
be

be said, "to be buried with him." In Mr. DAVY's *Bapt. of Adult Believ.* p. 114.

53. HEIDEGGERUS: "Baptism signifies the death and burial, both of Christ and of believers, in the abolition of the old man, as well initial, in this life, as perfect, in laying down the body of the sins of the flesh; the resurrection and vivification, first of Christ, then of ourselves; the obedience of Christ, even to death, which has the power of justifying and of delivering from death; regenerating grace, and the Spirit, purifying our hearts; our union with Christ, and the communion of believers with him; and lastly, a resurrection to life." *Historia Patriarch.* Tom. I. p. 565.

54. MOMMA: "As baptism represents the death and burial of our Lord, so also his resurrection, and seals our communion with him. Paul therefore teaches, Col. ii. 12. that *we are buried with him by baptism*. For the baptismal water, so far as it suffocates, is a manifest emblem of death; as it covers, of a burial; as it purifies, of a resurrection." *De Statu Eccles.* Tom. II. C. v. § 199.

55. RIGALTIIUS: "Dipping into the baptismal water, denotes the person to be deeply tinged with the Christian faith; his being overwhelmed, signifies his cleansing from moral stains and filth; and his rising up out of the water, his resurrection." In Mr. STENNETT, *against* Mr. RUSSEN, p. 71.

56. ANONYMOUS: "The Apostle seems here [Rom. vi. 4.] to allude to the manner of baptism; indicating that this, as well as the words made use of at the time, signified a kind of death: for the body being wholly immersed in water at baptism, so that it no longer appeared, represented its being buried—And the body rising from the water, after it had been wholly

wholly immersed in it, so as to be as it were buried under it, was in some degree a figure, or representation, of Christ's rising from the grave." *Illustration of the Bible*, on Rom. vi. 4.

57. Dr. WELLS: "St. Paul here alludes [Rom. vi. 4.] to immersion, or dipping the whole body under water, in baptism: which he intimates did typify the death and burial (of the person baptized) to sin; as his rising up out of the water did typify his resurrection to newness of life." *On Rom. vi. 4.*

58. Mr. HARDY: "*Therefore we are buried with him by baptism.* He alludes to the rite of immersing, which bears an image of our Lord's burial. *That like as Christ was raised.* For the rising again of the body out of the water, bore an image of that fact." *Annotat. in Rom. vi. 4.*

59. Dr. BARROW: "The action is *baptizing*, or immersing in water. The object thereof, those persons of any nation, whom his ministers can by their instruction and persuasion render disciples; that is, such as do sincerely believe the truth of his doctrine, and seriously resolve to obey his commandments—The immersion also in water, and the emergence thence, doth figure our death to the former [worldly defilements,] and receiving [reviving] to a new life." *Works*, Vol. I. p. 518, 520. Edit. 1722.

60. Dr. JOHN EDWARDS: "Some of the Fathers—hold that the Apostle's argument in the text [1 Cor. xv. 29.] is of this sort; *If there shall be no rising of the dead hereafter*, why is baptism so significant a symbol of our dying and rising again, and also of the death and resurrection of Christ? For those that were proselytes to the Christian religion, were interpreted to make an open profession of these, their being plunged into the baptismal water, and  
in

in being there overwhelmed and buried, as it were, in the consecrated element. The immersion into the water, was thought to signify the death of Christ; and their coming out, denoted his rising again, did not less represent their own future resurrection. On which account the minister's putting in of the Christian converts into the sacred waters, and his taking them out thence, are styled by St. CHRYSOSTOM, *The sign and pledge of descending into the state of the dead, and of a return from thence.* And thus because the washing and plunging of the newly admitted Christians was a visible proof and emblem, first of Christ's, and then of their resurrection from the grave; the forementioned Fathers have been induced to believe, that this passage of our Apostle, which I am speaking of, hath a particular respect to that, and is to be interpreted by it. Nay this seems to agree exactly with the language and tenour of our Apostle himself, who may be thought to be the best interpreter of his own words; *Know ye not, saith he, that so many of us as have been baptized into Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore, we are buried with him by baptism, &c.* Rom. vi. 3, 4." *Enquiry into four Remarkable Texts*, p. 143, 144.

61. PETER MARTYR: "As Christ, by baptism, hath drawn us with him into his death and burial; so he hath drawn us out unto life. This doth the dipping into the water, and the issuing forth again, signify, when we are baptized." *Oration concerning the Resurrection of Christ*, subjoined to *Comm. Places*, p. 11. Edit. 1574.

62. E. SPANHEMIUS: "As immersion signifies the death of the old man, and emersion the life of the new man; so sprinkling signifies and seals the sprinkling of the blood of Christ, 1 Pet. i. 2." *Disputat. Syntag. Disp. de Bap.* § 21.

63. COCCÆIUS: "*We are buried with him by baptism into death*, Rom. vi. 3, 4, 5. We are baptized into death, by which the servitude of sin is laid aside; and thus a seal of our communion with him is bestowed on us, that we may be considered as buried with him—In baptism there is a resemblance of our Lord's death." *Summa Doct. de Fœd. C. VI. § 209.*

64. Bp. TAYLOR: "*We are buried with him in baptism*, saith the Apostle. *In aqua tanquam in sepulchro caput immergentibus vetus homo sepelitur et submergitur, deinde nobis emergentibus novus resurgit inde.* So S. CHRYSOSTOM; *The old man is buried and drowned in the immersion under water; and when the baptized person is lifted up from the water, it represents the resurrection of the new man to newness of life.* In this case, therefore, the contrary custom [of pouring, or sprinkling] not only being against an ecclesiastical law, [of the Church of England] but against the analogy and mysterious signification of the sacrament, is NOT TO BE COMPLIED WITH; unless in such cases that can be of themselves sufficient to justify a liberty in a ritual and ceremony, that is, a case of necessity." *Ductor Dubitantium, B. III. C. IV. Rule xv. p. 645.*

65. Sir NORTON KNATCHBULL: "The proper end of baptism ought not to be understood, as if it were a sign of the *washing away* of sin—but, properly, it is the sign of a *resurrection*, by faith in the resurrection of Jesus Christ, of which baptism is a very lively and expressive figure; as was also the ark of Noah, out of which he returned, as it were out of a sepulchre to a new life—And so was the whale's belly, out of which Jonah arose, after a three days burial; and the cloud and the Red sea, in which the people of Israel are said to have been baptized; that

that is, not washed, but buried. For all these were types of the same thing with baptism; not of the washing away of sin, i. e. the putting off the filth of the flesh; but of the death and resurrection of Christ, and at the same time of ours. To this truth, Apostles, Fathers, Schoolmen, and almost all interpreters, give their suffrage. The thing is indeed so manifest, that there is no need of testimonies to confirm it: but because there are not a few that otherwise teach, it will not be superfluous, (that I may not seem to speak without proper authority) out of innumerable testimonies to produce a few. We begin with St. PAUL. *Know ye not that so many as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the Father of glory, even so we also should walk in newness of life,* Rom. vi. 3, 4. and Col. ii. 12. as also 1 Cor. xv. 29. *Else what shall they do who are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all?* As if he had said, If there be no resurrection, to what purpose are we baptized? In vain does the church use the sign of baptism, if the dead rise not. Similar testimonies frequently occur in the Fathers. For instance: *That believing on his death, by his baptism ye may be rendered partakers of his resurrection.* IGNAT. *Ep. ad Tral. Baptism was given, or appointed, to set forth the death of our Lord.* *Ep. ad Philadel.* in the name of IGNAT. *In baptism we perform the signs of his passion and resurrection.* JUST. MART. *We know one saving baptism, seeing there is but one death for the world, and one resurrection from the dead, of which baptism is a type.* BASIL. MAG. *Hear Paul speaking aloud, They passed through the sea, and were all baptized in the cloud and in the sea. He calls their*  
VOL. I. I *passage*



*passage through the sea, BAPTISM; for it was an escape from death accomplished by water.* BASIL. SELEUC. *To be baptized and plunged, then to return and emerge, are a sign of our descent to Hades, and of an ascent from it.* CHRYSOST. *Baptism is a pledge and figure of the resurrection.* AMBROS. *Baptism is an earnest of the resurrection.* LACTAN. *Dipping bears the resemblance of death, and of a burial.* BERN. I might accumulate innumerable testimonies, but these I think are abundantly sufficient to prove, that baptism is properly a type of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ;—and also of all believers that are baptized into the faith of him, from a death in sin to newness of life; which if they do in this world, they have a most firm hope that after death they shall, with Christ, arise to glory.” *Animadversf. in Lib. Nov. Test: ad 1. Pet. iii. 20, 21. p. 178, 179, 180. Oxon. 1677.*

66. Bp. HOADLY: “This latter expression [*buried with Christ and rising with him*] made use of by St. Paul, with relation to baptism, is taken from the custom of immersion in the first days; and from that particular manner of baptizing proselytes: by which they were first covered with water, and in a state as it were of death and inactivity; and then arose out of it into a sort of new state of life and action. And if baptism had been then performed, as it is now amongst us, we should never have so much as heard of this form of expression, of *dying and rising again* in this rite.” *Works, Vol. III. p. 890.*

67. Dr. SCOTT: “Those phrases, *buried with Christ*, and *risen with Christ*, are only the sense and signification of that Eastern custom in baptism, viz. of plunging the baptized person under water, and raising him up again—and the significancy of them the

the Apostle here [Rom. vi. 3, 4, 5.] plainly tells us, wholly refers to the death, and burial, and resurrection of Christ; and therefore the plunging under water must necessarily refer to Christ's death and burial, and the raising up again, to his resurrection." *Works*, Vol. I. 446. Edit. 1718.

68. ANONYMOUS: "The water [of baptism] symbolically expresses, by immersing into it, the death of Christ, or *being baptized* into his death, Rom. vi. 3; emerging out of it, his resurrection, and our rising with him unto righteousness—the whole body of sin, with all its members, dying with him to sin by immersion, and by emersion rising with him to newness of life." *Cure of Deism*, Vol. I. Chap. iv. p. 120, 121, 124.

69. MR. DOUTRIN: "What did this dipping in [in the administration of baptism] signify? By the dipping in, and remaining for a little space under, and rising up out of the water, was signified the communion of believers with Christ, in his death, burial and resurrection. See Rom. vi. 3, 6." *Scheme of Div. Truths*, Chap. xxii. Quest. 25.

70. DR. BAIGUY: "Baptism—represents to our view a purification from sin. The Apostle indeed carried his idea farther, and considered the act of immersion in water as signifying a *burial*; the termination of our sinful life: and the rising again from the water as a new birth; as an entrance, that is, on a life of piety and virtue." *Discourses on Various Subjects*, p. 302.

71. DR. TOWERSON: "One other particular there is, wherein I have said the water of baptism to have been intended as a sign; and that is in respect of that manner of application, which was some time used, I mean the *dipping* or *plunging* the party

baptized in it. A signification which St. Paul will not suffer those to forget, who have been acquainted with his Epistles. For with reference to that manner of baptizing we find him affirming, Rom. vi. 4. *That we are buried with Christ by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.* And again, verse 5. *that if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection.* To the same purpose, or rather yet more clearly, doth that Apostle discourse, where he tells us, Col. ii. 12. *that as we are buried with Christ in baptism, so we do therein rise also with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.* For what is this but to say, That as the design of baptism was to oblige men to conform so far to Christ's death and resurrection, as to die unto sin, and live again unto righteousness; so it was performed by the ceremony of immersion, that the person immersed might, by that very ceremony, which was no obscure image of a sepulture, be minded of the precedent death; as, in like manner, by his coming again out of the water, of his rising from that death to life, after the example of the Institutor thereof?—The thing signified by the sacrament of baptism, cannot otherwise be well represented, than by an immersion; or, at least, by some more general way of purification, than that of effusion, or sprinkling. For though the pouring, or sprinkling of a little water upon the face, may suffice to represent an internal washing, which seems to be the general end of Christ's making use of the sacrament of baptism; yet can it not be thought to represent such an entire washing, as that of new-born infants was, and as baptism may seem to have been intended for, because

because represented as *the laver of regeneration*: That, though it do [not] require an immersion, yet requiring such a general washing at least, as may extend to the whole body; as other than which cannot answer its type, nor yet that general, though internal purgation, which baptism was intended to represent. The same is to be said yet more upon the account of our conforming to the death and resurrection of Christ, which we learn from St. Paul, to have been the design of baptism to signify. For though that might, and was well enough represented, by the baptized person's being buried in baptism, and then rising out of it, yet can it not be said to be so, or at least but very imperfectly, by the pouring out, or sprinkling the baptismal water on him. But, therefore, as there is so much the more reason to represent the rite of immersion, as the **ONLY LEGITIMATE** rite of baptism, because **THE ONLY ONE** that can answer the ends of its institution, and those things which were to be signified by it; so, especially if (as is well known, and undoubtedly of great force) the general practice of the primitive church, was agreeable thereto, and the practice of the Greek church to this very day. For who can think either the one or the other would have been so tenacious of so troublesome a rite, were it not that they were well assured, as they of the primitive church might very well be, of its being the **ONLY INSTITUTED AND LEGITIMATE ONE?**" *Of the Sacram. of Bap.* Part III. p. 51, 52, 53, 56, 57, 58.

72. **BENGELIUS**: "He that is baptized puts on Christ, the second Adam; he is baptized, I say, into a whole Christ, and therefore also into his death: and it is like as if, in that very moment, Christ suffered, died, and was buried for such a man; and such a man suf-

ferred, died, and was buried with Christ." *Gapton*, ad Rom. vi. 3.

73. BOCHARTUS: "The plunging performed in baptism signifies a death to sin; and the emersion, a new life." *Opera*, Tom. I. p. 1029. Edit. 1682.

74. DAILLE: "In the primitive church—the greater part of those that were baptized, being persons of age—were unclothed, and then plunged into the water, whence they immediately came forth;—whereby they testified that they did put off the body of sin, the habit of the first Adam, and buried it in the saving waters of Jesus Christ, as in its mystical grave, and came forth thence risen up to a new life." *Sermons on Epist. to Coloss.* Chap. ii. 12. p. 245.

75. VENEMA: "It is generally agreed among divines, that the communion of a believer with Christ and the effects of his obedience, by which the guilt, the pollution, and the punishment of sin are taken away, and so the remission of sin, sanctification, and glorification are conferred, are presented to view in baptism: yet they do not sufficiently show the way and manner in which that representation is made, and frequently speak with but little consistency. If, in baptism, the appearance of nothing but *washing* offered itself to our consideration, the thing would be easy. For seeing we are delivered from sin by the obedience of Christ, that would be readily understood by every one, as the cause of our purification, and as represented by water, in which there is a cleansing virtue; especially, as the Scripture usually comprehends it under the emblem of water. But washing is neither the only idea, nor, as I think, the principal one, of this sacrament; but more truly that of *suffocating*, and of bringing *death* on the flesh, an effect which water produces, seems here to be intended;

tended: as well, because the Apostle asserts it in express words, Rom. vi. 3, 4. Col. ii. 12. as that baptism is elsewhere compared to the deluge and the Red sea, 1 Pet. iii. 21. 1 Cor. x. 1, 2. Why? Because in the former passage Peter calls baptism *αντιτυπον*, the *antitype* of the water of the deluge; which word there, in a special and peculiar sense, denotes a *parallel*; by which is declared, that the deluge and baptism depict the same spiritual thing, and in a mystical representation answer one another: and, lastly, because the Apostle, 1 Pet. iii. 21. seems to derive the idea of washing, from that power of *killing* which there is in water. For the death of sin, and of the flesh, really and properly consists in the washing away of spiritual filth; and therefore is rightly comprehended under the appearance of *putting to death*. When, therefore, Peter had compared baptism to the deluge, and so had attributed to it the power of cleansing; he immediately beholds in it *σαρκος αποδεσιν ποτε*, a *putting off the filth of the flesh*. Further; That the idea of *washing* is not the first and the principal signification of baptism, plainly appears from the rite of *immersion*; in which way it used to be administered by the Apostles and first Christians; for that leads us to think, not so much of *washing*, as of *putting to death*. Once more; The phrase, *laver of regeneration*, which is used by Paul, Tit. iii. 5. does not so properly signify washing, as *renovation from death*.

“ Let us try, then, in this way to unfold the mystery. The water, as is manifest, both from the immersion of Christ, and the comparison with the deluge and the Red sea, denotes what is called, the *punishing justice* of God; by which a sinner is not acquitted, without the public sanctification of Je-

Jehovah's name, which is usually denominated the *wrath* of God. Into this justice Christ was immersed. He took it on himself, when he was perfected by sufferings and put to death; by which he not only bore, but placated the wrath of God. So that, being freed from the sins which were laid upon him, he rested in the sepulchre in peace; for the curse was then taken from the earth. But he obtained a more excellent sign of sin being expiated, and of justice being satisfied, in his resurrection from the dead; when he was not only justified, but also obtained the whole promised glory, which is his most complete emerſion. This is the *baptism* of Christ, concerning which he speaks, Matt. xx. 22; and this was represented by the baptism of water, that was administered to him by John. This is the righteousness of Christ, accomplished by his obedience and death; by which, being released from a charge of guilt, he received a right to the promised blessings. Hence, further, a judgment must be formed concerning the baptism of believers; seeing their communion, not only with the righteousness of Christ, but also with the manner of obtaining it, is, in a certain way, signified and sealed; in which the mystery of baptism consists.

“ That this may a little more plainly appear, it must be maintained, that the foreſaid communion with Christ consists both in the imputation of his righteousness, as it is usually called in the schools, and in a real communication of it. The former, for the sake of Christ's righteousness, confers justification by the gracious sentence of God, and implies that believers were comprehended in their Sponsor; so that whatever Christ suffered, they may be esteemed as having undergone. According to this benign interpretation, they are themselves reputed as immersed in

in the justice of God; and, in Christ, they also possess a right of acceptance in a more excellent manner than if they themselves had obtained it: which great mystery of our faith is first of all presented to view in baptism, and is made sure to believers by a seal and pledge—This, if I may so speak, is our *imputative* immersion in the justice of God, and emergence out of it; our death and resurrection, which baptism exhibits to view." *Dissertat. Sac.* L. II. C. xiv. § 9, 10, 11, 12.—See also Dr. WATTS's *Hymns*, B. I. No. 122. Mr. MARCHANT's *Exposit. of New Test.* on Col. ii. 12. VANDER WAEYEN *Varia Sacra*, in Gal. iii. 27. p. 84. H. HULSH *Comment. in Israel. Priv. Prærog.* p. 801. Mr. T. BRADBURY's *Duty and Doctr. of Bap.* p. 83. *Hist. of Popery*, Vol. I. p. 196.

## REFLECTIONS.

REFLECT. I. Baptism being a gracious appointment of God, it must have an important meaning; and as it is a positive ordinance, the whole of its design must be fixed by divine institution. For we have no more authority to invent a signification for any rite of holy worship, than we have to appoint the rite itself. The design of baptism, therefore, must be learnt from the New Testament; and from such parts of that sacred Volume, as have an immediate reference to it. See CHAP. I. No. 2, 16, 20.

Were we divested of partiality and prepossession, there is reason to conclude that it would not be very difficult to discover the chief design of our Lord in his positive appointments. The following words of Dr. OWEN are here worthy of notice. 'This was a great part of the imperfection of legal institutions,



that they taught the things which they signified and represented *obscurely*, and the mind of God in them was not learned but with much difficulty—But all the ordinances and institutions of the Gospel do give light into, and exhibit the things themselves unto the minds and faith of believers. Hereon they discern the reasons and grounds of their use and benefit; whence our whole worship is called our *reasonable service*, Rom. xii. 1 \*.

That positive ordinances derive all their utility from divine institution, and that it is of great importance to know and comply with the revealed intention of God in their appointment, Pædobaptists have abundantly taught. Thus Dr. HUNTER, for instance: 'Positive and arbitrary institutions derive all their value and use, from a right understanding of their meaning, and the design of their Author†.' Dr. OWEN: 'There is nothing in religion that hath any efficacy for compassing an end, but it hath it from God's appointment of it to that purpose—God may in his wisdom appoint and accept of ordinances and duties unto one end, which he will refuse and reject when they are applied unto another—To do a thing appointed unto an end, without aiming at that end, is no better than the not doing it at all; in some cases much worse‡.' Mr. BAXTER: 'We must not take liberty, upon our own fancies, to add new ends to God's ordinances§.' Nay, he represents the annexing of a new design to the ordinance before us, as the inventing of *a new baptism*||. To

\* On Heb. vii. 11. Vol. III. p. 171. † *Sacred Biography*, Vol. III. p. 215. ‡ *Mortification of Sin*, Chap. iii. On Heb. x. 5---10, and on Heb. ii. 1. § *Plain Script. Proof*, p. 301. Edit. 4th. || *Disputations of Right to Sac.* p. 162.

these declarations we cordially assent without the least hesitation.

REFLECT. II. These learned authors are almost unanimous in considering baptism as principally intended, by the great Legislator, to represent the *death*, *burial*, and *resurrection* of Christ; the *communion* his people have with him in those momentous facts; and their *interest* in the blessings thence resulting. To confirm and illustrate which, they agree in applying the declarations of Paul, recorded in Rom. vi. 4. and Col. ii. 12. Now, if such be the chief design of the ordinance; if these passages of holy writ be pertinently applied; and if there be any correspondence between the sign and the things that are signified by it; immersion must be the mode of administration. Nay, supposing our *purification from sin* by the blood of Christ, were the first and principal thing intended and suggested by baptism; yet the same consequence would naturally follow. For that purification must be either partial, or complete. Not the former, our opposers themselves being judges. It must, therefore, be the latter. Of perfect purification, then, baptism is either an expressive emblem, or it is not. If not, why such a ritual service appointed in preference to any other that might have exhibited the blessing in a far more striking point of light? To this reasoning Pædobaptist authors give attestation. Thus, for example, STAPFERUS: ‘Between an arbitrary sign and the thing signified, there may be an agreement, or similitude; which is the reason of one sign being chosen, rather than another. And by how much the more a sign is fitted to excite certain thoughts, and to represent the thing signified; by so much the better, or more useful, it is. Whence it follows, that the illustration

tion of an invisible thing, depends on the **LIKENESS** there is, between the **SIGN** and the **SPIRITUAL OBJECT** to be represented in the mind\*.—**MR. BLAKE**: 'They [sacraments] are analogical signs, such as carry analogy and proportion with the thing signified; they have ever an aptness in them for resemblance. That of **AUSTIN** is famous; *If sacraments carry no resemblance of the things whereof they are sacraments, they are no sacraments at all*†.—**JACOB. LAURENTIUS**: 'In all sacraments there ought to be some similitude, or analogy, between the sign and the thing signified‡.' **MASTRICHT**: 'Similitude and analogy, between the sign and the thing signified, are necessarily supposed in every sacrament§.'—**CHAMIERUS**, when handling this particular, and having produced the saying of **AUSTIN** that is mentioned by **MR. BLAKE**, immediately adds; 'In which all divines have acquiesced, as in an oracle||.'—If in baptism, then, there be an expressive emblem of *perfect* purification from sin, immersion must be the mode of administration; because nothing short of that represents a total washing. I may here venture an appeal to the common sense of mankind; Whether pouring or sprinkling a little water on the *face*, or an immersion of the *whole body*, be better adapted to excite the idea of an entire cleansing. See No. 71.

**REFLECT. III.** **DR. ADDINGTON** tells us, that the supposition of Paul's alluding here [Rom. vi. 3, 4.] to the mode of immersion in baptism, as bearing a resemblance to the burial and resurrection

\* *Institut. Theol. g. Polem.* Tom. I. Cap. iii. § 1625. + *Covenant sealed*, p. 45. ‡ *Dialog. Fac. theol.* Cap. iv. § 51. § *Theologum*, L. VII. C. iii. § 8. || *Paraphr. at.* Tom. IV. L. I. C. xi.

‘ of Christ, is entirely founded on a mistaken interpretation of the passage. Without referring in the least to that, or any other mode of administering the ordinance, Paul gives us an account of the nature and design of it; as figuring, not any scenes through which our Redeemer passed, but that great change on the heart of the true Christian convert, which is effected by the washing of regeneration \*.’ If, then, the Apostle give ‘ us an account of the nature’ of baptism, as well as of its design, he must speak of baptism *itself*; which cannot but include the mode of administration. This he does when representing it under the notion of a *burial* with Christ.— Yet were we, in opposition to these numerous and respectable authors, to understand the passage as referring only to the design of the ordinance, immersion would still be the proper mode of administration. For supposing, though far from granting, that Paul means only to give an account of the ordinance, as figuring that great change on the heart of a real convert; yet while it is allowed that he speaks of this important change under the notion of a death, a burial, and a resurrection; and while it is maintained that baptism is a *figure* of that change; we are naturally led to conclude, that immersion is the only suitable mode. What *figure*, what *resemblance* is there, of a death, a burial, and a resurrection, in sprinkling a few drops of water on the face of a person? or, if there be any similitude between the act and the things intended, it is of that kind which Dr. ADDINGTON himself describes, when he says; ‘ A strong imagination, or a prejudiced mind, may find an object, and then point out a resemblance in many particulars; but no reader of judgment and caution will

\* *Christian Minist. Reasf.* p. 44, 45.

\* strain so obscure an allusion? See Chap. II. No. 1, 33, 36, 71, 75. Mr. HENRY having given a view of the passage similar to that of Dr. ADDINGTON, Mr. JENKINS replies; 'A Quaker would thank him for the remark, that *our conformity to Christ lies not in the sign, but in the thing signified*; and prove from his own words, that this text does not intend water-baptism, but some inward work so expressed; as also, that the Lord's supper means no external ordinance, but an inward conformity to Christ's death†.'—The people called Quakers, when commenting on the passage before us, express themselves in the following manner. WILLIAM DELL: 'You see, that the same baptism of the Spirit that makes us die with Christ, doth also quicken us into his resurrection, and deprives us of our own life; not that we may remain dead, but that it may communicate to us a better life than our own, even the life of Christ himself‡.' JOHN GRATTON: 'Can any man conclude, that Paul here speaks of water baptism? Is it not plainly said, *into Christ*? Not into water, but into Christ, into death§.' ROBERT BARCLAY considers Rom. vi. 3, 4. Gal. iii. 27. and Col. ii. 12. as expressing the effects of what he calls the baptism of the Spirit ||. So nearly does the sense of the passage, according to Dr. ADDINGTON, coincide with that of the Quakers. We may therefore conclude, that whether baptism was intended to represent a purification from sin, by the blood of Christ; or the death of the old, and the quickening of the new man, by the Spirit of God; or the death, burial, and resurrection of our divine Sponsor; im-

\* Ut supra, p. 37.      † Inconsistency of Infant Sprinkling with Christian Bap. p. 98.      ‡ Select Works, p. 404, 405.      § Life of JOHN GRATTON, p. 171. Edit. 1720.      || Apology, Proposition XII. § 4.

merſion is the only proper way of its adminiſtration. By this mode of proceeding, *all* thoſe ideas are fully and ſtrongly expreſſed; which cannot be affirmed of pouring or ſprinkling, becauſe neither the one nor the other is adapted to the alluſions in the ſacred text. Beſides, it is highly probable, as Bp. HOADLY has well obſerved, that if pouring or ſprinkling had been practiſed in the apoſtolic times, ‘we ſhould never have ſo much as heard of *dying*, and *riſing again*,’ in baptiſm. See No. 66.

REFLECT. IV. WITSIUS has obſerved, that there is little or no analogy between *wafers*, which are uſed in the holy ſupper by Roman Catholics, and the *bread* which our Lord appointed for that purpoſe\*. It has alſo been maintained that real bread ſhould not only be uſed, but *broken*, at the Lord’s table, to preſerve and exhibit the intended analogy. With reference to this, HEIDEGGER ſays; ‘Between the *breaking* of bread and the *crucifixion* of the body of Chriſt, there is an analogy, or likeneneſs: which analogy ſufficiently demonſtrates the neceſſity of *breaking* the bread in the ſacred ſupper†.’ So, likewise, various eminent Pædobaptiſts have pleaded for the baptiſmal immerſion, to prevent the gracious deſign of our Lord in the ordinance from being obſcured and loſt. Thus WOLFRIUS: ‘There have been ſome learned Chriſtians who were of opinion, that the rite of plunging ſhould be recalled into practice, leſt the myſtical ſignification of baptiſm *ſhould be entirely loſt*‡.’ Sir NORTON KNATCHBULL obſerves, that the true and genuine reaſon of baptiſm being appointed ‘*is almoſt loſt*,’ by the change of immerſion into pouring or

\* OEcon. L. IV. C. xvii. § 7.    † Corp. Theolog. Loc. XXV. § 83.  
‡ Curæ, ad Rom. vi. 4.

sprinkling\*. The very famous BUDDEUS, after having given a summary view of the arguments for immersion, from ZELTNERUS, adds; ‘He who accurately considers these things will be of opinion, that they are by no means to be blamed, who, though they do not reject sprinkling, yet *wish that immersion had never been deserted*; or, if possible, that it might be restored: among whom is SPENERUS, nay, LUTHER himself—That all doubts and scruples may be removed, the advice of ZELTNERUS, a very learned divine of Altorf, should certainly be received; who persuades to the use of *a larger affusion*, that by so doing the want of immersion may be compensated†.—Now, Reader, what think you of these declarations from the pens of Pædobaptists, whose characters are high in the learned world, and in the Protestant churches? Could they have spoken more strongly in our favour, without pronouncing pouring and sprinkling a mere nullity? What but evidence of the strongest kind could induce persons of such a character implicitly to condemn their own practice, as insufficient to answer the design of baptism? The Papists, indeed, may as well pretend that the bread, or the wine, used alone at the Lord’s table, fully represents the design of the ordinance; as for any to say that the intention of baptism is completely answered by pouring or sprinkling a few drops of water on any part of the body: and as well might FRANCISCUS *a Sancta Clara* reconcile the Thirty Nine Articles to the Canons of the Council of Trent‡, as any of our Brethren accommodate Rom. vi. 3, 4. and Col. ii. 12. to their

\* Annotat. ad 1 Pet. iii. 21.      † Theolog. Dogmat. I. V. C. i. § v. p. 1055.      ‡ See Dr. WATERLAND’S *Importance of Doctr. of Trinity*, p. 211.

own practice. Dr. NICHOLS, in defiance of common sense, when defending the custom of kneeling at the Lord's table,\* asserts; That the Dissenters 'themselves, 'by their posture of *sitting*, no more represent a 'feast than we [of the Church of England] do by 'kneeling\*:' and it is with equal propriety pretended by some, that a death, a burial, and a resurrection, are exhibited to view, as well by pouring or sprinkling, as by immersion.

Hence it is that some of those learned Pædobaptists, produced in the preceding pages, finding it hard, if not, impossible, to reconcile the obvious and genuine meaning of Rom. vi. 3, 4. and Col. ii. 12. with the natural import of their own practice; manifestly speak, as if the ordinance of baptism represented *one* thing in the apostolic times, and *another* now. See No. 7, 42. What can be the reason of this? If there be only *one* baptism, as the Apostle asserts; and if that institution be not altered since the time of Paul; it must have the very same signification, and that in the same degree: because it must represent the same objects, with an equal perspicuity, and in the same way, as when administered by that Ambassador of Christ. It must be entirely the same, whether practised in Judea, or in Britain; in the first, or in the eighteenth century. How lamentable it is to think, that such great men as H. ALTING, F. TURRETTIN, and various others, should sacrifice thus to the love of hypothesis!

REFLECT. V. Some of these eminent Pædobaptists, far from viewing the metaphorical baptism of which the Apostle speaks, 1 Cor. x. 2. as militating

\* In Mr. PEIRCE's *Vindicat. of Dissenters*, Part III. p. 206.



against the necessity of immersion; represent it as conveying the same leading idea with Rom. vi. 4. and Col. ii. 12 : which latter passages are undoubtedly much in our favour. See No. 7, 65, 75.—To the opinion of TURRETTIN, KNATCHBULL, and VENEMA, on 1 Cor. x. 2. we may add the sentiments of several others, whose characters are high in the learned world. GROTIUS, on the passage, expresses himself thus : ‘ The cloud hung over the heads of the Israelites ; and so the water is over those that are baptized. The sea surrounded them on each side ; and so the water encompassed those that are baptized.’—WITSIUS, when remarking on the text, speaks to this effect : ‘ How were the Israelites *baptized in the cloud, and in the sea*, seeing they were neither immersed in the sea, nor wetted by the cloud ? It is to be considered, that the Apostle here uses the term baptism in a figurative sense ;—yet there is some agreement even in the external sign. The sea is water, and a cloud differs but little from water. The cloud hung over their heads ; and so the water is over those that are baptized—The sea surrounded them on each side ; and so the water, in regard to those that are baptized\*.’—BRAUNIUS, in perfect agreement with No. 7, 65, 75. says ; ‘ The Israelites are said to be *baptized in the cloud and in the sea* ; and it represented a death, and a resurrection, 1 Pet. iii. 21. Rom. vi. 3, 4†.’—Still more fully Mr. GATAKER : ‘ The going down of the Israelites into the bottom and middle of the sea, and their coming up from thence to dry ground, have a great agreement with the rite of Christian baptism, as it was administered

\* *Oecon. Fad.* L. IV. C. x. § 11. Vid. ejusdem *Miscell. Sac.* Tom. II.

p. 529. † *Doctrina Fad.* Loc. XVIII. C. x. § 7.

‘in the first times: seeing the persons to be baptized went down into the water, and again came up out of it; of which *going down* and *coming up*, express mention is made in the baptism of the Ethiopian Eunuch; Acts viii. 38, 39. Nay, further, as in the Christian rite, when persons are baptized, they are overwhelmed, and as it were buried in water, and seem in a manner to be *buried with Christ*; and again, when they emerge, they arise as out of a sepulchre, and are represented as risen again with Christ, Rom. vi. 4, 5. Col. ii. 12: so the Israelites might seem, when passing through the waters of the sea that were higher than their heads, to be overwhelmed, and as it were buried; and again to emerge and arise, when they escaped to the opposite shore\*.’—Mr. POOLE’s Continuator: ‘Others most probably think that the Apostle useth this term [baptism] in regard of the great analogy betwixt baptism, as it was then used; the persons going down into the waters, and being dipped in them, and the Israelites going down into the sea, the great receptacle of water: though the waters at that time were gathered on heaps, on either side of them, yet they seemed *buried* in the water, as persons in that age were when they were baptized.’—Dr. HAMMOND: The cloud was ‘a concave body over their heads, and so coming down to the ground like wings inclosing and encompassing them on every side—and dry ground being left them in the midst of the channel, and the sea encompassing them on every side, before them, behind them, on the right hand, and on the left, and so the cloud environed them in like manner; the sea environed them also.’—Dr. WHITBY: ‘They were *covered with the sea on both sides*, Exod. xiv. 22. So that

\* *Adversar. Miscel. Cap. iv.*

Both the cloud and the sea had some resemblance to our being covered with water in baptism. Their going into the sea, resembled the ancient rite of going into the water; and their coming out of it, their rising up out of the water.—HULSIUS: ‘Baptism, and indeed immersion in the sea, continued for a time; but they were baptized longer under the cloud\*.’—Bp. PATRICK: ‘God, by the covering of the cloud, took them under his wings and protection, owning them for his people; and they passing through the heart of the sea, the waters inclosing them round about, did profess to trust in God, and there to drown all the thoughts of Egypt which sometimes they feared, and sometimes they loved overmuch†.’—Mr. BURKITT: ‘The Israelites are here said to be *baptized in the cloud, and in the sea*: that is, the cloud which overshadowed them, did sometimes bedew and sprinkle them; and the Red sea, through which they passed, had its waters gathered into two heaps, one on the right hand, and the other on the left, betwixt which the Israelites passed, and in their passage seemed to be buried in the waters; as persons in that age were put under the water, when they were baptized: and thus were Israel baptized in the cloud and in the sea.’

Other learned Pædobaptists there are, who, when commenting on the text, do not seem to have the least suspicion of its being inimical to the necessity of immersion. For instance: CAMERO, on the passage, says: ‘How were the Israelites baptized in the cloud and in the sea? for they were neither dipped in the sea, nor wetted by the cloud.’ BENJELIUS: ‘They were baptized in the cloud, inasmuch as they were

\* Comment, in *Israel. Prærog.* Dissert. ii. § 25. † *Discourse of the Lord's Supper*, p. 417, 418.

‘under it; and in the sea, seeing they passed through  
 ‘it: but neither the cloud nor the sea wetted, much  
 ‘less immersed them (though some conjecture from  
 ‘Psal n lxxiii. 9. and cv. 39. that a miraculous rain  
 ‘fell from the cloud) nor is the appellation, *baptism*,  
 ‘extant in the narrative of Moses. Nevertheless, Paul  
 ‘very agreeably denominates it thus, because a cloud  
 ‘and the sea are both of a watery nature; therefore  
 ‘Paul says nothing of the fiery pillar: and because  
 ‘the cloud and the sea withdrew the fathers from sight  
 ‘and returned them, almost in a similar manner as the  
 ‘water \*does those that are baptized\*.’ MARC-  
 KIUS: ‘The Israelites were covered with the cloud  
 ‘from above under the conduct of Moses, so that  
 ‘they were as if immersed in those heavenly wa-  
 ‘ters: and this was intended, not to prefigure the  
 ‘future external baptism of water in the Christian  
 ‘church, as many both ancients, and moderns have  
 ‘rashly thought;—but to intimate the same grace of  
 ‘Christ which baptism now seals to us†.’ See CHAP.  
 IV. No. 20.—Now, either these learned authors were  
 extremely inadvertent; or they were very generous  
 to their opponents, in giving up an argument well  
 adapted to defend their own practice; or our opposers  
 proceed on a gross mistake, when they plead this pas-  
 sage against us. Besides, as every one sees the term  
*baptized* is here used merely by way of allusion; and  
 as the allusive acceptance of a word should never be  
 made the standard of its literal and proper sense; it  
 must be very incongruous to produce this passage in  
 favour of sprinkling, and shows great poverty of ar-  
 gument in defence of the common practice. See  
 CHAP. II. REFLECT. VIII.

\* *Gnomon*, in loc. † *Bib. Exercitat. Exercit. viiii. § 12.*

REFLECT. VI. If then so many of the most eminent Pædobaptists agree, that the term baptism, properly speaking, signifies immersion ; and if, to so great a degree, they further unite in declaring that the principal facts represented by the ordinance are, the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, as the substitute of his chosen people ; their communion with him in those facts, and their interest in the blessings procured by them ; we have reason to conclude, on their own principles and concessions, that there neither is, nor can be, any valid plea for pouring or sprinkling, as a proper mode of administration. This must be the case, except it should appear on further enquiry, that the Apostles and first Christians did not practise what the name of the ordinance is allowed to imply, and the design of the institution seems to require. We must therefore consider, in the following Chapter, what some of the most learned Pædobaptists have to say on that part of the subject.

• CHAPTER IV.

*The Practice of John the Baptist, of the Apostles, and of the Church in succeeding Ages, in regard to the Manner of administering the Ordinance of Baptism.*

N. B. Candour demands we should here acknowledge, that though these numerous and learned authors have expressed themselves in the following manner; yet many of them insist upon it as highly probable, that the Apostles did sometimes administer baptism by pouring or sprinkling.

**W**ITSIUS: "It is certain that both John the Baptist, and the disciples of Christ, ordinarily practised immersion; whose example was followed by the ancient church, as VOSSIUS hath shown by producing many testimonies from the Greek and Latin writers. *Disp. I. de Baptismo*, Thes. vi. and also HOORNBECK, *de Baptismo Veterum*, Sect. iv." *Œcon. Fœd. L. IV. C. xvi. § 13.*

2. LENFANT: "*In the water—in the Holy Ghost.* These words do very well express the ceremony of baptism, which was at first performed by plunging the whole body in water, as also the copious effusion of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost." *Note*, on Matt. iii. 11. Eng. Translat.

3. ANONYMOUS: "If we have regard to the manner in which the idea of baptism is naturally adapted to the situation of a guilty creature, zealous to express his abhorrence of sin; or to the general practice of the Jewish, as well as other Eastern nations; to the example of our Lord, and of his disciples; and  
to

to the most plain and obvious construction of the Greek language ; we shall be inclined to believe that Infant *sprinkling* is not an institution of Christianity, but a deviation from the original rite, which was performed by dipping, or plunging into water—The arguments by which the Pædobaptists support their practice and doctrine appear to us to be so forced and violent, that we are of opinion, nothing but the general prevalence of Infant sprinkling could have so long supported it.” *English Review*, for Nov. 1783. p. 351.

4. GURTNERUS: “ The action in this element of water, is immersion ; which rite continued for a long time in the Christian church, until, in a very late age, it was changed into sprinkling : of which an example is hardly to be found in ancient history, except what relates to the Clinics, or sick persons, who when confined to their beds were to be initiated by the sign of the covenant of grace. Hence baptized persons are said to have *descended into the water*, and to be *buried with Christ into death*, Matt. iii. 16. Acts viii. 38. Rom. vi. 4 : for they who are immersed in water are covered with it, and as it were buried in it, until they arise out of it.” *Institut. Theolog. Cap. xxxiii. § 117, 118.*

5. Bp. DAVENANT: “ In the ancient church, they not only sprinkled, but immersed those whom they baptized.” *Expos. Epist. ad Colos. in Cap. ii. 12.*

6. PICTETUS: “ As to the manner of administering baptism, it was usual in ancient times for the whole body to be immersed in water ; as appears from Matt. iii. 6, 16. John iii. 23. and Acts viii. 38. This rite might be used in those warm countries ; and it must be confessed that such a right most happily represented that grace by which our sins are as it were

CHAP. IV.] *The Church in following Ages.* "We were drowned, and we raised again from the abyss of sin." *Theolog. Christ. L. XIV. C. iv. § 17. Genev. 1696.*

7. DR. ROBERT NEWTON: "It must be confessed that in the primitive times, and in those hot countries where the gospel was first preached, baptism for the most part was administered by dipping or plunging the person baptized into water—This ceremony of washing with water was the usual way among the Jews of receiving proselytes—and from thence it was introduced by our Saviour into his church." *Pract. Expofit. of Catechism*, p. 294, 295.

8. PISCATOR: "Ἰὼτα πολλά, signifies many rivers; as ἰὼρ, in the singular number, denoted the river Jordan. This is mentioned to signify the ceremony of baptism which John used; that is, immersing the whole body of a person standing in the river. Whence Christ being baptized of John in Jordan, is said to *ascend out of the water*, Matt. iii. The same manner was observed by Philip, Acts viii. 38." *Ad Joh. iii. 23.* in Mr. HENRY LAWRENCE'S *Treatise of Bap.* Chap. v. p. 64.

9. ABP. SECKER: "Burying, as it were, the person baptized in the water, and raising him out of it again, without question was anciently the more usual method: on account of which St. Paul speaks of baptism, as representing both the death and burial, and resurrection of Christ, and what is grounded on them, our being dead and buried to sin, renouncing it, and being acquitted of it; and our rising again to walk in newness of life. *Lectures on the Catechism*, Lect. xxxv.

10. MASTRICHT: "The sign representing, or the element in baptism, is water;—the sign applying, is washing,—whether it be performed by immersion,



199 *Practice of the Apostles, and of* [Rom. vi. 11].

(Matt. iii. 6, 16. John iii. 23. Acts viii. 38.) which ONLY was used by the Apostles and primitive churches; because it is not only more agreeable in the warm Eastern countries, but also more significant, Rom. vi. 3, 4, 5: or whether it be performed by sprinkling, which is not destitute of its foundation and analogy, (1 Pet. i. 2. Heb. x. 22. compare Isa. lii. 15. and Ezek. xxxvi. 25.) and is more agreeable in these countries." *Theologia*, L. VII. C. iv. § 9.

11. CALVIN: "From these words, Joh. iii. 23. it may be inferred, that baptism was administered by John and Christ, by plunging the whole body under water—Here we perceive how baptism was administered among the ancients; for they immersed the whole body in water. Now it is the prevailing practice for a minister only to sprinkle the body or the head." *In* Joan. iii. 23. *Comment.* in Act. viii. 38.

12. SPANHEMIUS: "To be baptized is denominated by Paul, a being *buried*, according to the ancient manner of baptizing. For immersion is a kind of burial; and emersion, a resurrection, to which the Apostle alludes, Col. ii. 12. So Christ, being baptized, *went up out of* the water, Matt. iii. 16. The same is related concerning the Ethiopian Eunuch, Acts viii. 38." *Dubiorum Evang.* Pars III. Dub. xxiv. § 2.

13. VITRINGA: "The act of baptizing, is the immersion of believers in water. This expresses the sense of the word. Thus also it was performed by Christ and the Apostles." *Aphorismi Sanct. Theolog.* 884.

14. Bp. PATRICK: "They [the primitive Christians] put off their old clothes, and stript themselves of their garments; then they were immersed all over, and

CHAP. IV.] *The Church in following Ages.* 193  
 and buried in the water." *Discourse of the Lord's  
 Supper*, p. 421.

15. MARLORATUS: "From these words [John  
 iii. 23.] it may be gathered, that baptism was per-  
 formed by John and Christ, by plunging of the whole  
 body." *Comment. ad Joan. iii. 23.*

16. Mr. STACKHOUSE: "The observation of  
 the Greek church, in relation to this matter [the  
 baptism of Christ] is this; That he who ascended out  
 of the water, must first descend down into it: and  
 consequently, that baptism is to be performed, not  
 by sprinkling, but by washing the body. And in-  
 deed, he must be strangely ignorant of the Jewish  
 rites of baptism who seems to doubt of this; since,  
 to the due performance of it, they required the im-  
 mersion of the whole body to such a degree of  
 nicety, that if any dirt was upon it, that hindered  
 the water from coming to the part, they thought the  
 ceremony not rightly done. The Christians, no  
 doubt, took this rite from the Jews, and followed  
 them in their manner of performing it. Accordingly,  
 several authors have shown, that we read no where in  
 Scripture of any one's being baptized, but by immer-  
 sion; and from the Acts of Councils and ancient Ri-  
 tuals have proved, that this manner of immersion  
 continued (as much as possible) to be used for *thirteen*  
*hundred years* after Christ. But it is much to be  
 questioned, whether the prevalence of custom, and  
 the over fondness of parents, will, in these cold cli-  
 mates especially, ever suffer it to be restored." *His-*  
*tory of the Bib.* B. VIII. Chap. i. p. 1234, 1235.  
*Note.* See also Dr. WHITBY, on Matt. iii. 16.

17. Mr. BURKITT: "Observe the manner of the  
 administration of baptism to the Eunuch; he *went*  
*down into* the water, and was baptized by Philip. In

those hot countries it was usual so to do, and we do not oppose the lawfulness of dipping in some cases, but the necessity of dipping in all cases." *Expos. Notes*, on Acts viii. 38.

18. Mr. JOHN WESLEY: "MARY WELSH, aged eleven days, was baptized according to the custom of the first church, and the rule of the church of England, by immersion. The child was ill then, but recovered from that hour—*Buried with him*—Alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion." *Extract of Mr. J. WESLEY'S Journal, from his embarking for Georgia*, p. 11. Edit. 2d. *Note*, on Rom. vi. 4.

19. CONFESSION OF HELVETIA: "Baptism was instituted and consecrated by God: and the first that baptized was John, who dipped Christ in the water, in Jordan." *Harmony of Confess.* p. 395.

20. ZANCHIUS: "The ancient church used to immerse those that were baptized. Thus Christ went down into Jordan and was baptized; as also others that were baptized by John. Of this thing, and of immersion, the passage of the people through the midst of the sea was a type; concerning which the Apostle speaks, 1 Cor. x. 2. *They were baptized*, says he, *in the sea*." *Opera*, Tom. VI. p. 217.

21. HOORNBEEKIUS: "We do not deny—that, in the first examples of persons baptized, they went into the water and were immersed." *Socin. Confut.* L. III. C. ii. Sect. I. Tom. III. p. 268.

22. DAILLE: "It was a custom heretofore in the ancient church, to plunge those they baptized over head and ears in the water—This is still the practice both of the Greek and the Russian church, even at this very day." *Right Use of the Fathers*, B. II. p. 148.

23. SAL-

23. SALMASIUS: "The ancients did not baptize otherwise than by immersion, either once, or thrice." Apud WITSIUM, *Œcon. Fad.* L. IV. C. xvi. § 13.

24. Mr. BOWER: "Baptism by immersion, was undoubtedly the apostolical practice, and was never dispensed with by the church, except in case of sickness, or when a sufficient quantity of water could not be had. In both these cases baptism by aspersion, or sprinkling, was allowed, but in no other." *Hist. of the Popes*, Vol. II. p. 110. Note. See also p. 121. Note.

25. Mr. POOLE'S CONTINUATORS: "A great part of those who went out to hear John were baptized, that is, dipped in Jordan—It is true, the first baptisms of which we read in holy writ, were by dippings of the persons baptized. It was in an hot country, where it might be at any time without the danger of persons' lives; where it may be, we judge it reasonable, and most resembling *our burial with Christ by baptism into death*: but we cannot think it necessary, for God loveth mercy rather than sacrifice; and the thing signified by baptism, viz. *the washing away the soul's sins with the blood of Christ*, is in Scripture expressed to us by pouring and sprinkling. Ezek. xxxvi. 25. Heb. xii. 14. 1 Pet. i. 2—It is from this [John iii. 23.] apparent, that both Christ and John baptized by dipping the body in water; else they need not have sought places where had been a *great plenty* of water—He [Paul] seems here [Rom. vi. 4.] to allude to the manner of baptizing in those warm Eastern countries, which was to dip or plunge the party baptized; and as it were to bury him for a while under water. See the like

108. *Practice of the Apostles, and of* [Chap. II.]  
 phrase; Col. ii. 12." *Annotations, on* Matt. iii. 6.  
 and xxviii. 19, 20. John iii. 21. Rom. vi. 4.

26. RAVANELLUS: "In the first institution of baptism, when adult persons were chiefly baptized, and that in a warm country, immersion was used; as appears from Matt. iii. 16. Acts viii. 36, 38, 39. Rom. vi. 4, 5. But in the present age, in which infants are generally baptized, and that in cold countries, aspersion is practised, according to the law of charity; yet without any injury to the nature of the sacrament." *Bibliotheca, sub voce, BAPTISMUS.* Genev. 1652.

27. MARCKIUS: "The action to be performed in the administration of baptism, is washing the body with water; which we think is rightly done, I. by immersion. (1) As in that act there is the greatest washing of the whole body. To signify which the word is therefore, (2) most frequently used. (3) It was commonly practised by John the Baptist, the disciples of Christ, (Matt. iii. 6, 16. John iii. 23. Acts viii. 38.) and the first Christians. And (4) to which reference is had, Rom. vi. 3, 4. Gal. iii. 27. Col. ii. 12." *Compend. Theolog. Christ.* Cap. xxx. §. 11. Vid. ejusdem *Bib. Exercitat.* Exercit. xxvii. §. 2, 3.

28. MOSHEIM: "The exhortations of this respectable messenger, [John the Baptist] were not without effect; and those who, moved by his solemn admonitions, had formed the resolution of correcting their evil dispositions and amending their lives, were initiated into the kingdom of the Redeemer by the ceremony of immersion, or baptism, Matt. iii. 6. Joh. i. 22.—The sacrament of baptism was administered in this [the second] century, without the public assemblies, in places appointed and

#### CHAP. IV.] *The Church in following Ages.* 199

and prepared for that purpose, and was performed by immersion of the whole body in the baptismal font—Those adult persons, that desire to be baptized [among the Collegiants] receive the sacrament of baptism, according to the ancient and primitive manner of celebrating that institution, even by *immersion*." *Eccles. Hist.* Cent. I. Part I. Chap. iii. § 3. Cent. II. Part II. Chap. iv. § 8. and Cent. XVII. Sect. II. Part II. Chap. vii. § 1.

29. Bp. TAYLOR: "The custom of the ancient churches was not sprinkling, but immersion; in pursuance of the sense of the word [baptize] in the commandment, and the example of our blessed Saviour. Now this was of so sacred account in their esteem, that they did not account it lawful to receive him into the clergy, who had been only sprinkled in his baptism, as we learn from the Epistle of CORNELIUS to FABIVS of Antioch, *apud* EUSEB. Lib. VI. Cap. xliii." *Ductor Dubitantium*, B. III. Chap. iv. Rule xv. p. 644.

30. CLIGNETUS: "In the primitive times, persons baptized were entirely immersed in water. Thus Christ was baptized, as we are informed Matt. iii. 16. where it is said, that Christ went up *out of the water*: for a coming out, supposes a going in. • To which form of baptizing Paul seems to have referred, Rom. vi. 4. Col. ii. 12. where he says, that *we are buried with Christ by baptism*: for a death and burial are better expressed by immersion, than by sprinkling." *In Theſaur. Disputat. Sedan.* Tom. I. p. 769, 770.

31. Mr. DOUTRIN: "How is this [baptismal] water administered to the baptized? Formerly it was done by dipping quite in; but in our climate only by sprinkling." *Scheme of Div. Truths*, Chap. xxii. Quest. 24.

32. Mr. DAVID MARTIN: "As baptism was performed by immersion, or plunging the entire person in a great depth of water; Jesus Christ has here [Mark x. 38.] used this expression in the same sense as the prophets have mentioned gulphs and great waters, metaphorically to represent great afflictions."

*Note, for* Marc x. 38.

33. Dr. PRIESTLEY: "This rite appears to have been generally, though probably not always, performed by dipping the whole body in water——It is certain that in very early times there is no particular mention made of any person being baptized by sprinkling only, or a partial application of water to the body." *Hist. Corrupt.* Vol. II. p. 66, 67.

34. BURMANNUS: "Immersion was used by the Jews, the Apostles, and the primitive church, especially in warm countries. To this various forms of speaking used by the Apostles refer, Rom. vi. 3, 4. Col. ii. 12. Gal. iii. 27. But in the West, and colder parts of the world, sprinkling prevailed." *Synops. Theolog.* Tom. II. Loc. XLIII. C. vi. § 9.

35. Mr. JOHN TRAPP: "There were, faith one, many ceremonies in baptism used in the primitive church; viz. putting off old clothes, drenching in water, so as to seem to be buried in it, putting on new clothes at their coming out, to which Paul alludeth in these words." *Commentary*, on Col. ii. 12.

36. GROTIUS: "That baptism used to be performed by immersion, and not by pouring, appears both from the proper signification of the word, and the places chosen for the administration of the rite, Joh. iii. 23. Acts viii. 38; and also from the many allusions of the Apostles, which cannot be referred to sprinkling, Rom. vi. 3, 4. Col. ii. 12." *Apud* POLUM, *Synops.* ad Matt. iii. 6.

37. CASTALIO and CAMERARIUS: "And were baptized. That is, they were immersed in water." Apud POT. I Synopsin, ad Matt. iii. 6.

38. BEZA: "Ye have put on Christ—This phrase seems to proceed from the ancient custom of plunging the adult, in baptism." *Annotat. ad Gal. iii. 27.*

39. Mr. BINGHAM: "The ancients thought that immersion, or burying under water, did more lively represent the death, and burial, and resurrection of Christ; as well as our own death unto sin, and rising again unto righteousness: and the divesting or unclothing of the person to be baptized, did also represent the putting off the body of sin, in order to put on the new man, which is created in righteousness and true holiness.—Persons thus divested, or unclothed, were usually baptized by immersion, or dipping of their whole bodies under water—There are a great many passages in the Epistles of St. Paul, which plainly refer to this custom; as this was the original apostolical practice, so it continued to be the universal practice of the church for many ages, upon the same symbolical reasons as it was first used by the Apostles—It appears from EPIPHANIUS and others, that almost all heretics, who retained any baptism, retained immersion also.—The only heretics against whom this charge [of not baptizing by a total immersion] is brought, were the Eunomians, a branch of the Arians." *Origin. Eccles. B. XI. Chap. x. § 1, 4.*

40. BUDDIUS: "Concerning baptism, it is particularly to be observed, that in the apostolic church it was performed by immersion into water; which, not now to mention other things, is manifest from this; The apostle Paul seeks an image, in this immersion, of the death and burial of Christ, and of mortifying the old man and raising up of the new. Rom. vi. 3, 4. There are, indeed, some authors who think otherwise, and



contend that sprinkling was practised in the apostolic church: to convince us of which, Dr. LIGHTFOOT has left no stone unturned. But what may be said in answer to his arguments, has already appeared in my *Institut. Theolog. Dogmat. L. V. C. i. § 5.* *Ecclesia Apostolica*, Cap. vii. p. 825, 826.

41. HEIDANUS: "That John the Baptist and the Apostles immersed, there is no doubt; (Matt. iii. 6, 16. Joh. iii. 23. Acts viii. 38.) whose example the ancient church followed, as is most evident from the testimonies of the Fathers." *Corp. Theol. Christ. Loc. XIV. Tom. II. p. 475.*

42. Mr. TWELLS: "*Therefore we are buried with him* by being plunged into a sort of death. [So the Author of the *New Text and Version of the New Testament* renders Rom. vi. 4.] What blundering explication is here? He should rather have said, by being plunged into a sort of grave, viz. the waters of baptism." *Critical Examination*, Part I. p. 98.

43. MENOCHIUS and ESTIUS: "The Apostle, in Rom. vi. 4. alludes to the rite of immersion, when the body is as it were buried, and in a little while drawn out again, as from a sepulchre." Apud POLUM, *Synops. ad Rom. vi. 4.*

44. LAMPE: "*Because there was much water there.* That plenty of water was necessary to the administration of baptism by immersion, to a very great multitude of people, is readily acknowledged." *Comment. in Evangel. secund. Joan. ad Cap. iii. 23.*

45. LIMBORCH: "Baptism, then, consists in washing, or rather immersing the whole body into water, as was customary in the primitive times—The Apostle alludes to the manner of baptizing, not as practised at this day, which is performed by sprinkling of water; but as administered of old, in the primitive church,

church, by immersing the whole body in water, a short continuance in the water, and a speedy emersion out of the water." *Compleat Syst. of Divin. B. V. Chap. xxvii. Sect. 1. Comment. in Epist. ad Rom. in Cap. vi. 4.*

46. Sir THOMAS RIDLEY: "The rites of baptism, in the primitive times, were performed in rivers and fountains: and this manner of baptizing the ancient church entertained from the example of Christ, who was baptized of John in Jordan." In THOMAS LAWSON'S *Baptifinalogia*, p. 105.

47. Mr. JOHN CLAUDE: "In his baptism, he [Christ] is plunged in the water." *Essay on Compos. of Serm. Vol. I. p. 272.*

48. H. ALTINGIUS: "This baptifinal washing, in warm countries and ancient times, was performed by immersion into water, a continuance under the water, and an emersion out of the water; as the practice of John the Baptist, Matt. iii. 6, 16. Joh. iii. 23; of Christ's Apostles, Joh. iii. 22. and iv. 1, 2; and of Philip, Acts viii. 38; and also the signification of these rites teach, Rom. vi. 4." *Loci Commun. Pars I. Loc. xii. p. 199.*

49. HOSPINIANUS: "John the Baptist baptized Christ in Jordan, and Philip baptized the Eunuch in a river, Acts viii. Lydia also, together with her household, seems to have been baptized in a river, near to Philippi, at which prayers were usually made. Acts xvi." *De Templis, L. II. C. iv. p. 80.*

50. CURCELLÆUS: "Baptism was performed by plunging the whole body into water, and not by sprinkling a few drops, as is now the practice. For John was baptizing in Ænon near Salim, because there was much water; and they came and were baptized, Joh. iii. 23. Nor did the disciples that were sent out by

Christ administer baptism afterwards in any other way: and this is more agreeable to the signification of the ordinance, Rom. vi. 4. I am therefore of opinion, that we should endeavour to restore and introduce this primitive rite of immersing, if it may be done without offence to the weak; otherwise it seems better to tolerate this abuse, than to raise a disturbance in the church about it—They are now ridiculed who desire to be baptized, not by sprinkling, but as it was performed by the ancient church, by an immersion of the whole body into water.” *Relig. Christ. Institut. L. V. C. ii. et apud HEIDEGG. Libert. Christ. a Lege Cib. Vet. C. xiv. § 3.*

51. WOLFIUS: “That baptismal immersion was practised in the first ages of the Christian church, many have shown from the writings of the ancients—Some learned Christians therefore have judged, that the same rite of immersion should be recalled into practice at this day, lest the mystical signification of the ordinance should be lost—Here the Apostle alludes to immersion in baptism, practised of old.” *Cura, ad Rom. vi. 4. et Col. ii. 12.*

52. G. J. VOSSIUS: “That John the Baptist and the Apostles immersed persons whom they baptized, there is no doubt. For thus we read; *And they were baptized in Jordan—And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water*, Matt. iii. 6, 16. It is also written, Joh. iii. 23: *John baptized in Enon near to Salim, because there was much water there.* And, Acts viii. 38. it is said; *They both went down into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch.* And that the ancient church followed these examples, is very clearly evinced by innumerable testimonies of the Fathers.” *Disputat. de Bap. Disp. I. § 6.*

53. SIR PETER KING: "To me it seems evident, that their [the primitive Christians] usual custom was, to immerse, or dip, the whole body." *Enquiry into the Constitut. of Prim. Church*, Part II. Chap. iv. § 5.

54. ABP. TILLOTSON: "Anciently, those who were baptized, put off their garments, which signified the putting off the body of sin; and were immersed and buried in the water, to represent their death to sin; and then did rise up again out of the water, to signify their entrance upon a new life. And to these customs the Apostle alludes, Rom. vi. 2—6. Gal. iii. 27." *Works*, Vol. I. Sermon VII. p. 179. Edit. 8vo.

55. FRID. SPANHEMIUS, F: "This rite of immersion, and of bringing out of the baptismal water, was common and promiscuous in the apostolic age. Whence the Apostle alludes to it, as a rite common to all Christians, Rom. vi. 4. Col. ii. 12." *Disputat. De Bap. pro Mortuis*, p. 16. annexed by Dr. DU VEIL, to his *Literal Exposition of the Acts*.

56. BP. PEARCE: "I think the most probable meaning of the phrase [*baptized for the dead*], is to be fetched from Matt. xx. 22. Luke xii. 50. and Mark x. 38; in all which places βαπτίζεσθαι signifies to die a violent death, by the hands of persecutors. It seems to have been a metaphor taken from the custom of those days in baptizing: for the person baptized went down under the water, and was (as it were) buried under it. Hence St. Paul says, in Rom. vi. 4. and Col. ii. 12. that they *were buried with Christ by baptism*. So that this custom probably gave occasion to our Saviour to express his being to suffer death by the hands of the Jews, in the phrase of *a baptism* that he was to be baptized with. And St. Paul seems to have taken up the same phrase.

phrase with a little variation, but still with the same meaning." *Note*, on 1 Cor. xv. 29.

57. Abp. USHER: "Some there are that stand strictly for the particular action of diving or dipping the baptized under water, as the only action which the institution of the sacrament will bear; and our Church allows no other, except in case of the child's weakness; and there is express in our Saviour's baptism, both the descending into the water, and the rising up." *Sum and Subst. of the Christ. Relig.* p. 413. Edit. 6th.

58. MOMMA: "They were wont to go down into the water. Philip and the Eunuch *went down into the water*, Acts viii. 38. Compare Verse 39. Christ also, being baptized, *went up from the water*, Matt. iii. 16. Therefore, he *went down into the water* to be baptized." *De Statu Eccles.* Tom. II. C, v. § 193.

59. THEOD. HASEUS: "Though, in the time of the Apostles, the custom was not known which prevailed in the following ages; namely, that persons, immediately after their baptism, were clothed with white garments which they wore for a week afterward, and thence were called, *Albati, Candidati*; yet seeing they were entirely immersed in water, they could not be baptized without putting off, and again putting on, their clothes." *Biblioth. Bremens.* Class. iv. p. 1042, 1043.

60. Mr. RICH. BAXTER: "We grant that baptism then, [in the primitive times] was by washing the whole body; and did not the differences of our cold country, as to that hot one, teach us to remember, *I will have mercy and not sacrifice*, it should be so here—It is commonly confessed by us to the Anabaptists, as our commentators declare, that in the Apostles'

times the baptized were dipped over head in the water, and that this signified their profession, both of believing the burial and resurrection of Christ; and of their own *present* renouncing the world and flesh, or dying to sin and living to Christ, or rising again to newness of life, or being buried and risen again with Christ, as the Apostle expoundeth, in the forecited texts of Col. iii. [Col. ii.] and Rom. vi. And though (as is before said) we have thought it lawful to disuse the manner of dipping and to use less water, yet we presume not to change the use and signification of it—For my part, I may say as Mr. BLAKE, that I never saw child *sprinkled*; but all that I have seen baptized had water *poured* on them, and so were washed.” *Paraphrase on the New Test.* at Matt. iii. 6. *Disputations of Right to Sacram.* p. 70. *Plain Script. Proof*, p. 134.

61. Bp. BURNET: “They [the primitive ministers of the gospel] led them into the water, and with no other garments but what might cover nature, they at first laid them down in the water, as a man is laid in a grave, and then they said those words; *I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.* Then they raised them up again, and clean garments were put on them: from whence came the phrases, of being *baptized into Christ’s death*; of our being *buried with him by baptism into death*; of our being *risen with Christ*, and of our *putting on the Lord Jesus Christ*; of *putting off the old man*, and *putting on the new*, Rom. vi. 3, 4, 5. Col. ii. 12. Col. iii. 1, 10. Rom. xiii. 14. After baptism was thus performed, the baptized person was to be farther instructed in all the specialities of the Christian religion, and in all the rules of life that Christ had prescribed.” *Expof. XXXIX Articles*, p. 374, 375.

62. BRAUNIUS: "Christ went down into Jordan, to be baptized by John, Matt. iii. The same thing seems to be intimated by the Apostle, when he speaks of being *buried by baptism*, Col. ii. 12. Rom. vi. 3, 4. Gal. iii. 27." *Doctrina Fæd.* Pars IV. Cap. xxi. § 8.

63. Mr. DE COURCY: "I grant—that the word [baptize] signifies to dip, and that the ordinance might have been administered by immersion in the ancient church." *Rejoinder*, p. 265, 266.

64. Mr. WEEMSE: "When [in the primitive times] they were baptized, they went down into the water, and were baptized all over the body." *Exposit. of Laws of Moses*, B. I. Chap. xlv.

65. Mr. T. WILSON: "Baptism—was performed in the primitive times by immersion." *Archæolog. Dict.* Article, BAPTISM.

66. ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES: "*Were baptized.* Washed by dipping in Jordan, as Mark vii. 4. Heb. ix. 10.—*Buried with him by baptism.* See Col. ii. 12.. In this phrase the Apostle seemeth to allude to the ancient manner of baptism, which was to dip the parties baptized, and as it were to bury them under the water for a while, and then to draw them out of it, and lift them up, to represent the burial of our old man, and our resurrection to newness of life." *Annotations, on Matt.* iii. 6. and Rom. vi. 4.

67. Mr. JOSEPH MEDE: "There was no such thing as sprinkling, or *ῥαντισμός*, used in baptism in the Apostles' days, nor many ages after them." *Discourse on Tit.* iii 5. *Works*, p. 63. Edit. 1677.

68. Dr. CAVE: "The party to be baptized was wholly immersed, or put under water, which was the almost constant and universal custom of those times; whereby they did more notably and significantly express

presents the three great ends and effects of baptism." *Primitive Christianity*, Part I. Chap. x. p. 203.

69. Dr. TOWERSON: "What the practice of those [primitive] times was,—will need no other proof than resorting to rivers, and other such like receptacles of waters, for the performance of that ceremony, as that too because there was *much water there*. For so the Scripture doth not only affirm concerning the baptism of John, Matt. iii. 5, 6, 19. Joh. iii. 23; but both intimate concerning that which our Saviour administered in Judea (because making John's baptism and his to be so far forth of the same sort, Joh. iii. 22, 23.) and expressly affirm concerning the baptism of the Eunuch, which is the only Christian baptism the Scripture is any thing particular in the description of. The words of St. Luke (Acts viii. 38.) being, that *both Philip and the Eunuch went down into a certain water*, which they met with in their journey, in order to the baptizing of the latter. For what need would there have been either of the Baptist's resorting to great confluxes of water, or of Philip and the Eunuch's going down into this, were it not that the baptism both of the one and the other, was to be performed by an immersion? A very little water, as we know it doth with us, sufficing for an effusion, or sprinkling." *Of the Sacram. of Bap.* Part III. p. 55, 56.

70. BOSSUET: "The baptism of St. John the Baptist, which served for a preparative to that of Jesus Christ, was performed by plunging—When Jesus Christ came to St. John, to raise baptism to a more marvellous efficacy in receiving it, the Scripture says, *that he went up out of the water* of Jordan, Matt. iii. 16. Mark i. 10.—In fine, we read not in the Scripture



Scripture that baptism was otherwise administered ; and we are able to make it appear, by the acts of Councils, and by the ancient Rituals, that for THIRTEEN HUNDRED YEARS baptism was thus administered *throughout the whole church*, as far as was possible." In Mr. STENNETT, *against RUSSEN*, p. 175, 176.

71. Mr. CHAMBERS: " In the primitive times this ceremony was performed by immersion ; as it is to this day in the Oriental churches, according to the original signification of the word." *Cyclopædia* ; Article, BAPTISM. Edit. 7th.

72. Mr. GEORGE WHITEFIELD : " It is certain, that in the words of our text [Rom. vi. 3, 4.] there is an allusion to the manner of baptism, which was by immersion ; which our own church allows, and insists upon it that children should be immersed in water, unless those that bring the children to be baptized assure the minister that they cannot bear the plunging." *Eighteen Sermons*, p. 297.

73. Dr. DODDRIDGE : " And after Jesus was baptized, as soon as he *ascended out of the water* to the bank of Jordan——And John was also at that time baptizing at Enon, which was a place near Salim, a town on the East side of Jordan ; and he particularly chose that place, because there was a *great quantity* of water there, which made it very convenient for his purpose. Nothing, surely, can be more evident, than that *πολλὰ ὕδατα*, *many waters*, signifies a *large quantity of water* ; it being sometimes used for the Euphrates, Jer. li. 13. *Septuag.* To which I suppose there may be an allusion, Rev. xvii. 1. Compare Ezek. xliii. 2. and Rev. i. 15. xiv. 2. xix. 6 ; where *the voice of many waters* does plainly signify the roaring of a high sea—

# CHAP. IV.] *The Church in following Ages.*

sea\*—Considering how frequently bathing was used in those hot countries, it is not to be wondered, that baptism was generally administered by immersion; though I see no proof that it was essential to the institution. It would be very unnatural to suppose that they [Philip and the Eunuch] *went down to the water*, merely that Philip might take up a little water in his hand to pour on the Eunuch. A person of his dignity had, no doubt, many vessels in his baggage, on such a journey through so desert a country; a precaution absolutely necessary for travellers in those parts, and never omitted by them. See Dr. SHAW's *Travels*, Pref. p. 4.—*Buried with him in baptism.* It seems the part of candour to confess, that here [Rom. vi. 4.] is an allusion to the manner of baptizing by immersion, as most usual in those early times; but that will not prove this particular circumstance essential to the ordinance—'They who practise baptism by immersion, are by no means to be condemned on that account; since on the whole that mode of baptism is evidently favoured by Scripture examples, though not required by express precept.' *Fam. Expos.* on Matt. iii. 16. Joh. iii. 23. Acts viii. 38. Rom. vi. 4. *Lectures*, Proposit. cliii. Corol. 1.

74. M. JURIEU: "The Ancients used to plunge persons into the water, calling on the adorable Trinity." In Dr. GALE's *Reflect. on Dr. WALL's Hist. Inf. Bap.* p. 193.

\* Dr. BENTLEY has given the following criticism on the words *ἐν πολλοῖς ὕδατι τοῦ ποταμοῦ*, Rev. xvii. 1. *Upon the many waters*; 'upon the vast, wide, and spacious waters: for it is known, that *πολλοίς* is often applied to continued quantity, as well as to discontinued; to magnitude and dimensions as well as to number.' *Sermon upon Popery*, p. 6. Camb. 1715.

Mr. Dr. CLERC: "The manner of baptizing at that time, by plunging into the water those whom they baptized, was an image of the burial of Jesus Christ." In Dr. GALE's *Reflect.* p. 193.

76. VENEMA: "It is without controversy that baptism in the primitive church was administered by immersion into water, and not by sprinkling; seeing John is said to have baptized in *Jordan*, and where there was *much water*, as Christ also did by his disciples in the neighbourhood of those places, Matt. iii. and John iii. Philip also *going down into the water* baptized the Eunuch, Acts viii. To which also the Apostle refers, Rom. vi.—Nor is there any necessity to have recourse to the idea of sprinkling in our interpretation of Acts ii. 41. where *three thousand souls* are said to be added to Christ by baptism; seeing it might be performed by immersion, equally as by asperision, especially as they are not said to have been baptized at the same time—The essential act of baptizing, in the second Century, consisted, not in sprinkling, but in immersion into water, in the name of each Person in the Trinity. Concerning immersion the words and phrases that are used sufficiently testify; and that it was performed in a river, a pool, or a fountain—To the essential rites of baptism, in the third Century, pertained immersion, and not asperision; except in cases of necessity, and it was accounted a *half-perfect* baptism—Immersion, in the fourth Century, was one of those acts that were considered as essential to baptism;—nevertheless, asperision was used in the last moments of life, on such as were called *Clinics*,—and also where there was not a sufficient quantity of water—BEVERIDGE, on the fiftieth *Apostolical Canon*, asserts, that the ceremony of sprinkling began to be used instead of immersion, about the time of Pope GREGORY,

#### CHAP. IV.] *The Church in following Ages.*

GORY, in the sixth Century ; but without producing any testimony in favour of his assertion ; and it is undoubtedly a mistake. MARTENE declares in his *Antiq. Eccles. Rit.* L. I. P. I. C. i. that in all the Ritual books, or Pontifical MSS. ancient or modern, that he had seen, immersion is required ; except by the Cenomanensian, and that of a more modern date, in which pouring on the head is mentioned. In the Council of Ravenna also, held in the year thirteen hundred and eleven, both immersion and pouring are left to the determination of the administrator : and the Council of Nismes, in the year one thousand two hundred and eighty four, permitted pouring, if a vessel could not be had ; therefore only in case of necessity—The Council of Celichith, in the beginning of the ninth century, forbade the pouring of water on the heads of infants, and commanded that they should be immersed in the font—Baptism was administered by immersion, in the twelfth Century—In the thirteenth Century, baptism was administered by immersion, thrice repeated ; yet so, that one immersion was esteemed sufficient, as appears from AUGERIUS *de Montfaucon*. That was a singular synodal appointment under JOHN *de Zurich*, bishop of Utrecht, in the year one thousand two hundred and ninety one, which runs thus ; *We appoint, that the head be put three times in the water, unless the child be weak, or sickly, or the season cold ; then water may be poured, by the hand of the priest, on the head of the child, lest, by plunging, or coldness, or weakness, the child should be injured and die.*" *Hist. Eccles. Secul. i. § 138. Secul. ii. § 100. Secul. iii. § 51. Secul. iv. § 110. Secul. vi. § 251. Secul. viii. § 206. Secul. xii. § 45. Secul. xiii. § 164.*

*Practice of the Apostles, and of* [CHAP. IV.

77. ALTMANNUS: "In the primitive church, persons to be baptized were not sprinkled but entirely immersed in water; which was performed according to the example of John the Baptist. Hence all those allusions: seeing, by immersion, they plainly signified a burial; by the following emersion out of the water, a resurrection; and agreeably to these ideas are those passages of scripture to be explained which refer to this rite. See Rom. vi. 3, 4, 5. Col. ii. 12. and Gal. iii. 27." *Meletem. Philolog. rit.* Tom. III. Exercit. in 1 Cor. xv. 29. § 8.

78. MAGDEBURG CENTURIATORS: "The Son of God was dipped in the water of Jordan, by the hand of John the Baptist—Philip baptized the Eunuch in a river, Acts viii. 38. It seems also that Lydia and her household at Philippi were baptized in a river, at which prayers were usually made, Acts xvi. 13, 16." *Cent. I. L. I. C. iv. p. 118. L. II. C. vi. p. 381.*

79. Dr. HAMMOND: John baptized "in a river, in Jordan, Mark i. 5; in a confluence of much water, Joh. iii. 23; because, as it is added, *there was much water there*: and therefore as the Jews, writing in Greek, call those lakes wherein they wash themselves *κολυμβηθραι*; so, in the Christian church, the *βαπτιστηριον*, or vessel which contained the baptismal water, is oft called *κολυμβηθρα*, a swimming or diving place." *Annotations, on Matt. iii. 1.*

80. CHAMIERUS: "Immersion of the whole body was used from the beginning, which expresses the force of the word *baptize*; whence John baptized in a river. It was afterwards changed into sprinkling; though it is uncertain when or by whom it commenced." *Pantheat. Cathol. T. IV. L. V. C. ii.*

§ 6.

81. Bp.

CHAP. IV.] *The Church in following Ages.*

81. Bp. FELL: "The primitive fashion of immersion under the water, representing our death, and elevation again out of it, our resurrection, or regeneration. *On the Epistles of Paul.* Note, on Rom. vi. 4.

82. DUTCH ANNOTATORS: "*Because there was much water there.* Because they that were baptized by John, went into the water with their whole bodies. See Matt. iii. 16. Acts viii. 38.—The Apostle seems here [Rom. vi. 3.] to allude to the manner of baptizing, much used in those warm Eastern countries; where men were wholly dipped into the water, and remained a little while under water, and afterwards rose up out of the water: to show that their dipping into and remaining in the water, is a representation of Christ's death and burial; and the rising up out of the water, of his resurrection." *On John* iii. 23. and Rom. vi. 3.

83. Bp. STILLINGFLEET: "Rites and customs, apostolical are altered; therefore men do not think that apostolical practice doth bind: for if it did, there could be no alteration of things agreeable thereunto. Now let any one consider but these few particulars, and judge how far the pleaders for a divine right of apostolical practice do look upon themselves as bound now to observe them: as dipping in baptism, the use of love-feasts, community of goods, the holy kiss, by TERTULLIAN called *signaculum orationis*\*: yet none look upon themselves as bound to observe

\* I will here subjoin a quotation from that spirited writer, Mr. VINCENT ALSOP. 'The *feasts of love*, and the *holy kiss*,' he replies, in his Answer to Dr. GOODMAN, 'were not at all institutions of the Apostles. All that the Apostle determined about them was, that supposing in their civil congresses and converse they salute each other, they should be sure to avoid all levity, wantonness,

6. *Practice of the Apostles, and of the Church.*  
 observe them now, and yet all acknowledge them to  
 have been the practice of the Apostles." *Irenicum*,  
 Part II. Chap. vi. p. 345.

84. H. HULSIUS: "Some interpret 1 Cor. xv.  
 29. concerning the baptism of *Chinics*, or persons  
 confined to their beds;—but this baptism changed  
 dipping into sprinkling, and was not practised in the  
 time of Paul." *Comment. in Israel. Prif.* p. 819.

wantonness, all appearance of evil: for religion teaches us not  
 only to worship God, but to regulate our civil actions in subor-  
 dination to the great ends of holiness, the adorning of the Gos-  
 pel, and thereby the glorifying of our God and Saviour. I lay  
 the same concerning the *feast of love*. The Apostle made it no  
 ordinance, either temporary or perpetual; but finding that such  
 a civil custom had obtained among them—he cautions them  
 against gluttony, drunkenness, all excess and riot, to which such  
 feasts, through the power of corruption in some, and the remain-  
 ders of corruption in the best, were obnoxious: which is evi-  
 dent from 1 Cor. xi. 21. The Apostle Paul, 1 Tim. ii. 8. com-  
 mands that *men pray every where lifting up holy hands*: can any ra-  
 tional creature imagine, that he has thereby made it a duty as oft  
 as we pray to *elevate our hands*? That was none of his design to  
 that age, or the present: but under a ceremonial phrase he wraps  
 up an evangelical duty. As if he had said, Be sure you cleanse  
 your hearts; and if you do *lift up your hands*, let them be no  
 umbrage for unholy souls.

Concerning *deaconesses*, I can find no such order or constitution  
 of the Apostles. It is true, they used in their travels and other  
 occasions the services and assistances of holy women, who cheer-  
 fully administered to their necessities, and are thence called *δια-*  
*κοναι*, and said *διακονειν*. But how childish is it to conclude an  
 order or institution from so slippery a thing as an *etymology*? The  
 angels are called *λειτουργικα πνευματα*, *ministering spirits*, Heb.  
 i. 14. Will any from hence infer that they read the *liturgy*? Ma-  
 gistrates are styled *λειτουργοι του Θεου*, and *διακονοι Θεου*, Rom.  
 xiii. 4. 6; and yet it is no part of their office to read *divine service*—  
 in a word, the duty of saluting with an holy kiss; the order of  
 all our feasts of love to God's glory; the ministering in our re-  
 spective places to the necessities of the saints. are as much in force  
 as ever, unless holiness be grown out of fashion." *Sober Inquiry*,  
 p. 285, 286.

85. DEHLINSIUS: "It is manifest that while the Apostles lived, the ordinance of baptism was administered, not out of a vessel, or a baptistery, which are the marks of later times; but out of rivers and pools: and that, not by sprinkling, but by immersion—So long as the Apostles lived, as many believe, immersion only was used; to which afterwards perhaps they added a kind of pouring, such as the Greeks practise at this day, having performed the true immersion." *Observat. Sac.* Pars II. Observ. xliv. § 3. Pars III. Obs. xxvi. § 2.

86. HEIDEGGERUS: "Plunging, or immersion, was most commonly used by John the Baptist and by the Apostles—It is of no importance whether baptism be performed by immersion into water, as of old in the warm Eastern countries, and even at this day; or by sprinkling, which was afterward introduced in colder climates." *Corpus Theolog. Christ.* Loc. xxv. § 35.

87. Mr. EDWARD LEIGH: "The ceremony used in baptism, is either dipping, or sprinkling: dipping is the more ancient. At first, they went down into the rivers; afterwards they were dipped in the fountains—ZANCHIUS and Mr. PERKINS prefer (in persons of age and hot countries, where it may be safe) the ceremony of immersion under the water, before that of sprinkling, or laying on the water, as holding more analogy to that of Paul, Rom. vi. 4." *Body of Div.* B. VIII. Chap. viii. p. 665.

88. Mr. HARDY: "They were baptized; that is, they were immersed in water. That this rite was commonly performed by plunging, and not by pouring, is indicated both by the proper meaning of the word, and by the passages relating to the ordinance: for the custom of sprinkling seems to have prevailed



Somewhat later, in favour of those who desired to give up themselves to Christ, or to be baptized, when lying ill of disease; whom others called *Clinics*—In *baptism*: The allusion is to the ancient custom of baptizing, when the body was immersed in water; and therefore putting off the clothes was required: whence those phrases, *putting off the old*, and *putting on the new man*, had their origin. This rite was a figure and an image, both of a burial and a resurrection; as well of Christ, which were conspicuous, as of what is internal, in Christians. Rom. vi. 4." *Annotat. in* Matt. iii. 6. Col. ii. 12.

89. MR. LOCKE: "We Christians, who by baptism were admitted into the kingdom and church of Christ, were baptized into a similitude of his death: We did own some kind of death, by being buried under water, which being buried with him, *i. e.* in conformity to his burial, as a confession of our being dead, was to signify, that as Christ was raised up from the dead, into a glorious life with his Father, even so we being raised from our typical death and burial in baptism, should lead a new sort of life." *Paraphrase on* Rom. vi. 4.

90. J. J. WETSTENIUS: "John baptized in the river Jordan, in Enon, because there was *much water*, Joh. iii. 23; and Christ, when he was baptized, went down *into the water*, Matt. iii. 16. And Christians, in baptism, are said to *put off their clothes*, Gal. iii. 27; to be *washed*, Tit. iii. 5. and to be *buried under the water*, Rom. vi. 4: all which are expressive, not of sprinkling, but of dipping." *Comment. ad* Matt. iii. 6.

91. ROELL: "It is certain that immersion into water, and emergence out of it, were practised—in  
Christian

**ORAC. IV.]** *Christian baptism, in the beginning.* *Gregg's Epist. ad Col. in Cap. ii. 12.*

92. Mr. WALKER: "Mr. ROGERS was for retrieving the use of dipping, as witnessed to by antiquity, approved by Scripture, required by the Church, (as then it was, except in case of weakness) and symbolical with the things signified in baptism: Which I could wish as well and as heartily as he, in order to making of peace in the church, if that would do it. If I may speak my thoughts, I believe the ministers of the nation would be glad if the people would desire, or be but willing, to have their infants dipped, without fear of being destroyed.' In Dr. WALL's *Hist. Inf. Bap.* Part II. Chap. ix. p. 475.

93. Dr. WHITBY: "It being so expressly declared here, [Rom. vi. 4.] and Colos. ii. 12. that we are *buried with Christ in baptism*, by being buried under water; and the argument to oblige us to a conformity to his death, by dying to sin, being taken hence; and this immersion being religiously observed BY ALL CHRISTIANS FOR THIRTEEN CENTURIES, and approved by our Church, and the change of it into sprinkling, even without any allowance from the Author of this institution, or any licence from any Council of the church, being that which the Romanist still urgeth to justify his refusal of the cup to the laity; it were to be wished, that this custom might be again of general use, and aspersion only permitted, as of old, in case of the CLINICK, or in present danger of death." *Note, on Rom. vi. 4.*

94. Bp. NICHOLSON: "The sacrament of baptism was anciently administered by plunging into the water, in the Western as well as the Eastern part of the church; and that the Gothic word . . . . .

and *Practice of the Apostles; and of* [CHAP. IV.]

(Mark i. 8. and Luke iii. 7, 12.) the German word *Täuffen*; the Danish word *Døbe*, and the Belgic *Doopen*, do as clearly make out that practice, as the Greek word βαπτίζω." In Dr. GALE's *Reflect. on Dr. WALL's Hist. Inf. Bap.* p. 191, 192.

95. QUENSTEDIUS: "It is highly probable, if not certain, that John the Baptist and the Apostles immersed the persons to be baptized into water. For thus we read, Matt. iii. 6, 16. *And they were baptized in Jordan. When Jesus was baptized, he immediately came up* (or as GROTIUS renders it, he had *scarcely ascended*) *out of the water.* Our Saviour therefore when he was baptized, first went down into the river, was plunged into the water, and afterwards came up out of it—That immersion into the water was practised by John, is gathered also from that reason of the Evangelist, John iii. 23. *John baptized in Enon near to Salim, because there was much water there*—With St. Paul, *to be baptized is to be buried*, Rom. vi. 3, 4. Immersion is, as it were, a burial; emergence, a resurrection; to which the Apostle alludes, Col. ii. 12. It is written, Acts viii. 38, 39. that Philip *went down with the Eunuch into the water*, and there baptized him; and it is added, that, the ordinance being administered, they both *came up out of the water*—Both the Eastern and the Western church was very observant of the rite of immersion, for a great number of years—Nor is there any instance among the more ancient writers, that I have observed, of baptism being administered by a simple aspersion." *Antiq. Bw. Pars I. C. iv. Sect. ii. Num. i. 1, 2, 4.*

96. Dr. WALL: "Their [the primitive Christians] general and ordinary way was to baptize by immersion, or dipping the person, whether it were an infant, or grown man or woman, into the water. This

is so plain and clear by an infinite number of passages, that as one cannot but pity the weak endeavours of such Pædobaptists as would maintain the negative of it; so also we ought to disown and shew a dislike of the PROFANE SCOFFS which some people give to the English Antipædobaptists, merely for their use of dipping. 'Tis one thing to maintain, that that circumstance is not absolutely necessary to the essence of baptism; and another, to go about to represent it as ridiculous and foolish, or as shameful and indecent; when it was in all probability the way by which our blessed Saviour, and for certain was the most usual and ordinary way by which the ancient Christians, did receive their baptism——'Tis a great want of prudence, as well as of honesty, to refuse to grant to an adversary what is certainly true, and may be proved so. It creates a jealousy of all the rest that one says——'Tis plain that the ordinary and general practice of St. John, the Apostles, and primitive church, was to baptize by putting the person into the water, or causing him to go into the water. Neither do I know of any *Protestant* who has denied it; and but *very few* men of learning that have denied, that where it can be used with safety of health, it is the most fitting way——John iii. 23. Mark i. 5. Acts viii. 38. are *undeniable proofs* that the baptized person went ordinarily into the water, and sometimes the baptist too. We should not know by these accounts whether the whole body of the baptized was put under water, head and all, were it not for two later proofs, which seem to me to put it out of question. One, that St. Paul does twice, in an allusive way of speaking, call baptism a *burial*; which allusion is not so proper, if we conceive them to have gone into the water only up to the arm-pits, &c. as it is if their whole body was

immersed. The other, the custom of the near succeeding times.—As for *sprinkling*, I say as Mr. BLAKE at its first coming up in England, *Let them defend it that use it*—They [who are inclined to Presbyterianism] are hardly prevailed on to leave off that SCANDALOUS custom of having their children, though never so well, baptized out of a basin, or porringer, in a bed-chamber; hardly persuaded to bring them to church; much farther from having them dipped, though never so able to endure it.” *Hist. of Inf. Bap.* Part II. Chap. ii. p. 462, 463. *Defence of Hist. Inf. Bap.* p. 129, 131, 140, 147\*. —See, also, Dr. ROBERTSON’s *Hist. Emp.* CHARLES V. Vol. III. p. 78. *ÆDERI Cateches. Racoviens. Profligat.* p. 98. MILTON’s *Parad. Lost*, B. XII. l. 438, 441, 442. *Encyclopæd. Britan.* Article, BAPTISM, Vol. II. p. 995. *Theſaur. Theolog. Philolog.* Tom. II. p. 569. LEYDECKERI *Idea Theolog.* L. VII. C. v. § 7. PETAVII *Theol. Dogmat.* L. II. de *Pœnitent.* C. i. § 11. EPISCOPII *Respons. ad Quæst.* XXXV. Dr. GRABE’s *Unity of the Church, and Expediency of Forms of Prayer*, Preface. CAJETANI *Annotat. ad Matt.* iii. 16. *Cases to Recover Dissenters*, Vol. III. p. 31. *Dict. of the Bible*, (three Vols. octavo) Vol. II. p. 709. BRANDT’s *Hist. Reform.* B. XLVIII.

\* The anonymous author of a book entitled, *Le Baptême Retabli*, gives us the following remarkable anecdote respecting immersion, as performed by one of the Roman Pontiffs. ‘Pope BENEDICT XIII. having occasion more than once to baptize adult persons, and among others nine Jews and Turks at one time; he instructed them himself, and after that he immersed them. With a view to every thing being performed in its natural and proper order, he made use of the ancient Rituals; which so much displeased the Cardinals, that not one of them would assist at the ceremony. This is what I myself, as well as others, have read under the article ‘ROME, in the public News Papers.’ *Le Bap. Retab.* Part II. p. 92, 93.

CHAP. IV.] *The Church in following Ages.* Page  
 Vol. IV. p. 56. Mr. OSTERVOLD'S *Grounds and*  
*Principles of Christ. Relig.* p. 311. Edit. 6th.  
 SCHEUCHZERI *Physica Sacra*, Tab. DCLXIV.

## REFLECTIONS.

REFLECT. I. Here we have a great number of the most respectable characters for solid learning, and many of them for eminent piety. They appear to testify what they know and what they believe concerning an ancient fact; a fact, in an acquaintance with which, the purity of a divine institution and obedience to the will of our Lord are not a little involved. The principal question on which they are cited to give their opinion, is; Whether John the Baptist, and the Apostles of Christ, administered baptism by immersion? A question this, which regards both fact and right. Because in whatever manner those venerable men, and lights of the world, performed that institution, we are bound to believe it was right; for they had too much knowledge and too much integrity to administer this branch of holy worship in a wrong way. Besides, they were not ignorant that their practice, in this respect, was to be viewed as a pattern, and to be considered as law, by the succeeding disciples of Christ.—The character and profession of those authors, who appear to give their thoughts on this important subject, leave no room for suspicion that they are biassed in favour of the Baptists: because partiality itself must confess, that if their judgment be under the influence of predilection, it most probably lies on the contrary side. Many of them also are beyond the reach of suspicion, in regard to their knowledge of ecclesiastical antiquity.

Let us now see what our impartial Friends the Quakers have to say on this part of the subject.

1. THOMAS LAWSON: "John the Baptist, that is, John the *Dipper*; so called because he was authorized to baptize in water—Such as *rhantize*, or sprinkle infants, have no command from Christ, nor example among the Apostles, nor the first primitive Christians for so doing—See the author of *rhantism*, that is, sprinkling; not Christ, nor the Apostles, but CYPRIAN; not in the days of Christ, but some two hundred and thirty years after." *Baptismalogia*, p. 7, 75, 117.

2. THOMAS ELLWOOD: "Ph—went down with him [the Eunuch] into the water, and—baptized him: which was no sooner done, and they come up out of the water again, but the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip." *Sacred Hist. of the New Test.* Part II. p. 335.

3. JOHN GRATTON: "Down into the water he [Jesus] goes, and fulfilled John's dispensation, or that righteousness required by it—and having fulfilled it, he went up straightway out of the water." *Life of JOHN GRATTON*, p. 150. See CHAP. II. REFLECT. I. No. 1, 7.—Such is the language of those who have no perceivable interest in the decision of this dispute.

On a brief review of the preceding quotations from learned Pædobaptist authors, it appears, That immersion was practised by JOHN the Baptist by the Apostles of Christ, and by the primitive Christians. See No. 1—94.—That our LORD himself was immersed by the venerable John. No. 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 16, 19, 20, 26, 27, 29, 30, 37, 41, 46, 47, 52, 57, 58, 62, 70, 73, 76, 78, 90, 95, 96.—That some of them expressly assert, and many of them implicitly allow, that the Scripture nowhere speaks of any being baptized, but by immersion. No. 10, 16, 23, 31, 36, 50, 67, 69, 71, 76, 80, 83, 85.—That the practice of immersion gave

gave occasion for some very singular and emphatical phrases to be used by the Apostles. No. 9, 12, 18, 30, 34, 36, 40, 45, 54, 55, 61, 66, 73, 82, 88, 89.—That the baptism of the three thousand affords no objection to the universal practice of immersion in those times. No. 6.—That plunging was the general and almost universal practice, for a long course of years. No. 70, 71.—That the churches of Helvetia &c. &c. &c. and the church of England in common cases requires, immersion. No. 19, 57, 93.—That one of these authors knew of no Protestant, who had denied immersion to have been the general practice of apostolic times; and of but very few learned men, who denied its being the fittest, if a regard to health do not forbid. No. 96.—That the custom of sprinkling is absolutely indefensible. *Ibid.*—That it is to be ridiculed the practice of immersion deserve censure. *Ibid.*—That sprinkling of infants is not an article of C. 3. No. 3, 67.—That it is uncertain when, and by whom, sprinkling was introduced. No. 5.—And that a restoration of the primitive practice is very desirable. No. 50, 51, 92, 93. See CHAP. III. REFLECT. IV. Such is the verdict which these Pæd-baptists give on the cause before us.

REFLECT II. Now is it not strange, strange to astonishment, that so many eminent men should thus agree in bearing testimony to immersion, as the apostolic example; when it is notorious that their own practice was very different? Just so the Papists acknowledge, that the apostolic church communicated at the Lord's table in both kinds; while they themselves unite in a contrary practice. Thus TOLETUS, for instance: 'It was an ancient custom in the church, from the times of the Apostles, to com-



communicate under both species. About this there is no controversy. This ancient custom is manifest from the words of Paul, 1 Cor. x. and xi.' SALMERO: 'No one denies that the Corinthians communicated under both species; yet we deny that custom to have the force of a divine precept\*.' At what these veterans in the cause of superstition may say, we have little reason indeed to be surprised; but is it not a wonderful phenomenon in the religious world, that such a number of the most learned Lutherans, Calvinists, and Arminians, abroad; together with English Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Independents; should all unite in one attestation, respecting the primitive mode of administering this ordinance; even while they opposed the Baptists, for considering immersion as absolutely necessary to a compliance with the divine command; and while they greatly differed among themselves, in respect of several particulars relating to the subjects and the design of baptism? To what can this remarkable agreement with us, as to the primitive mode of proceeding, be ascribed? And what is the reason of their differing so much among themselves? The true reason, I take to be this: When they unite in declaring their views of the apostolic pattern, they have clear, strong, indubitable evidence, arising from the meaning of the name which the ordinance bears, and the inspired narrative of the first Christian churches. Each of them feels the ground on which he treads. Hence their union; and here they agree with us.—On the other hand, when they differ among themselves, about the foundation of an infant's claim on the ordinance; concerning the degree of necessity and the utility of Pædobaptism; about sponsors, the

\* Apud LAURENTIUM, *Dialog. Eucharist.* C. ii. § 62, 63.

## CHAP. IV.] *The Church in following Ages.*

sign of the cross, and so on; they argue on general principles and moral considerations. This kind of argumentation is quite foreign to the nature of positive rites; and yet, by a long train of deductions from such principles, they infer their various rules of proceeding in the administration of baptism. Hence they differ among themselves. Nor need we wonder. For as moral considerations are exceedingly various, and as the application of each to practice may be greatly diversified; so, according to the complexion of the principle adopted as the foundation of an argument, will the natural inference be, whether it regard the mode or the subject of any ordinance. Whenever ideas, therefore, of moral fitness, of expediency, or of necessity, usurp the place of divine precepts and apostolic examples, relating to positive institutions of the Christian church; the most learned and the best of men will always differ in their conclusions, and that in proportion as their notions of what is fitness, expediency, or necessity, vary. For it is notorious, that while one esteems this or the other thing extremely proper and highly useful to the cause of religion, another despises it as absurd, or detests it as injurious. But when our divine Lord, addressing his disciples in a positive command, says, 'It shall be so,' or when, speaking by an apostolic example, he declares, 'It is thus;' all our own reasonings about fitness, expediency, or utility, must hide their impetinent heads. The finest powers of reason have nothing to do, in this case, but only to consider the natural, the obvious import of his language, and then submit. To reason any further here, is only to seek a plausible excuse for rebellion against the sovereign majesty of HIM who is King in Zion.

**REFLECT. III.** It is, I think, a good rule which Dr. OWEN gives, relating to divine institutions, when he says; ‘That which is *first* in any kind, gives *the measure* of what follows in the same kind\*.’ With Dr. OWEN, Abp. TILLOTSON perfectly agrees. He expresses himself thus; ‘This is reasonable, that the *first* in every kind should be the *rule* and *pattern* of the rest, and of all that follow after; because it is likely to be the most perfect. In process of time, the best institutions are apt to decline, and by insensible degrees to swerve and depart from their first state; and therefore it is a good rule to preserve things from corruption and degeneracy, often to look back to the *first institution*, and by that to correct those imperfections which almost unavoidably creep in with time†.’ To the judgment of these two eminent authors, I will add the suffrage of Mr. HENRY, who speaks with a professed regard to baptism in the following manner: ‘When a question was put to our Lord Jesus, by the Pharisees, concerning marriage, he refers them to the institution and original law, Matt. xix. 3, 4. to teach us to go by the *same rule* in other ordinances. Run up the stream of the observation (which in a long course sometimes contracts filth) to the spring of the institution, and see *what it was from the beginning*‡.’—These directions perfectly coincide with that maxim of unerring wisdom, to which Mr. HENRY adverts; *From the beginning it was not so*. A maxim of such importance, that whoever can is ready to avail himself of it. For, as Mr. BLAKE justly observes, ‘If we can but say, *From the beginning it*

\* *Inquiry into Orig. Nat. and Constitut. of Churches*, Pref. p. 54.

† *Works*, Vol. II. p. 170. Fol. 1722.

‡ *Treatise on Bap.*

~~Clear~~ [?] ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~following~~ ~~ages~~  
~~was not so~~ ~~we have sufficient~~ To which I will  
 add the suffrage of Dr. RINGLEY; 'The example of  
 'our Saviour and his Apostles—ought to be a rule  
 'to the churches in all succeeding ages†'. Conse-  
 quently, if at the beginning of the Christian church  
 baptism was immersion, as appears by the foregoing  
 testimonies; it ought to be so now‡. This must be  
 the case, except there be evidence of our sovereign  
 Lord having repealed his first order, and altered the  
 original plan of proceeding: but no such pretence is  
 made by our Brethren.—Perfectly agreeable to this,  
 is the following language of a learned Pædobaptist in  
 opposition to the Church of Rome. 'If so then, [in  
 'the apostolic times] why not now? Does not that  
 'reason still hold good? Who hath made this change?  
 'Who hath sown these new tares in the church?  
 'How crept in this false doctrine? How grew up this  
 'corrupt absurd practice? Certainly, from no other  
 'than that abominable root, which gives being to the  
 'whole body of Popery, viz. pride and usurpation§.'

It must, indeed, be acknowledged, that though the  
 numerous and learned authors just produced, consider  
 immersion as practised by the Apostles; yet many of  
 them think it highly probable, that pouring or sprink-  
 ling was used on some occasions, in those primitive  
 times. A supposition this, too much like that of the  
 Roman Catholics, when they speak to the following  
 effect: 'Though wine was *commonly* used by those  
 'who partook of the holy supper, in the apostolic

\* *Covenant Sealed*, p. 111. Vid. VITRING. *De Synag. Vet. Pro-*  
*legom.* p. 75. † *Body of Div. Quest.* 168, 169, 170. Vid.

Dr. OWEN *On Church Government*, p. 62, 92. ‡ Id esse  
 verum quodcunque prius: id esse adulterum, quodcunque poste-  
 rius, says TERTULLIAN. That is, *Whatever was first, is true:*  
*Whatever was introduced afterwards, is a corruption.* § *Hist. of*  
*Popery*, Vol. I. p. 160.

‘*ago*; yet a participation of that element is not essential to the ordinance: nor is it demonstrable that the Apostles always used it when they celebrated the death of their Lord. Nay, the contrary seems rather to be implied, when they call the administration of that solemn appointment, *Breaking of BREAD*.’—Mr. PAYNE has justly observed, with regard to the holy supper, that it would have been very strange had the Apostles acted contrary to its institution in the course of their practice, and in so short a time after its first appointment\*: which observation may be applied to the subject before us.—But we answer more directly, by asking; Whether the Apostles and their associates did not administer baptism in obedience to divine law? Whether the commanding terms in every law, divine or human, should not be understood in their most commonly received sense; except there be some intimation of a different acceptation being intended? Whether the primary and most common meaning of the word *baptism*, be not immersion? And, whether the act of solemnly immersing a person, does not more fully express the great design of the ordinance, than pouring or sprinkling? Now, if learning and impartiality unite in demanding an affirmative answer to these queries, as appears from quotations already produced; there is not the least reason to doubt, but the Apostles always practised immersion.

Very few of our opposers, if I mistake not, have dared absolutely to deny, either the lawfulness of immersion, or that the Apostles ever used it. But if lawful, it must be so in virtue of a divine command, or of some authentic example; because it is a

\* *Preservative against Popery*, Title VII. p. 111.

## CHAP. IV.] ~~The Church in following Agati~~

positive rite, and when performed by us, it is as a religious duty. If, then, a divine precept require immersion, by what authority is pouring or sprinkling at all used? for that plunging, pouring, and sprinkling, are three different actions, will not admit of a doubt. Or, does our Lord, in the same enabling term of the same law, warrant *all* those different modes of proceeding, and compliment the human will with a liberty of choosing that which is most agreeable? Were that the case, it would be a strange law indeed, when considered as enacted by our divine Sovereign! Have we any instance of this kind in the sacred Records? Nay, the majesty of a human legislator would be disgraced by such a conduct.—On the other hand, if pouring or sprinkling be *naturally* inferrible from our Lord's command (and he must be of a perverse turn, who pleads for an inference confessedly *unnatural*;) and if the Apostles, or the primitive church, ever practised the one or the other; it is hard to imagine how they came to use immersion at all: either of the former, considered simply in itself, being more easy, and more agreeable to human feelings, both in regard to the administrator and the candidate. So, had Abraham and his male posterity been left at their option, to circumcise either a *finger*, or the *foreskin*; we might have safely concluded, without express information, which they would have preferred—so preferred, as never to have practised the other. It is far more natural therefore to conclude, that immersion was changed into *sprinkling*, than that sprinkling was laid aside for *immersion*: and of this Pædobaptists themselves will furnish us with sufficient evidence in a following Chapter.

Further: Had the Apostles practised pouring or sprinkling, a *basin*, or something similar, must have been  
been

been frequently used on the solemn occasion. Is it not then a wonder that the sacred Historians, when recording so many instances of the ordinance being administered, no where mention such a domestic utensil, nor any thing like it, as employed by the administrator? Our Brethren perhaps may say; 'This was a trifling circumstance, and not worthy of particular notice.' We find, however, that when our Lord washed the feet of his disciples, as he made use of a basin, it is expressly mentioned\*. Now that pedilavium being a single instance, not intended as an ordinance of divine worship, nor yet, in a literal sense, as a binding example on the followers of Christ; it is quite unaccountable that the inspired historic pen should so expressly mark the use of a basin on that occasion, and yet pass over in silence its very frequent service at the administration of baptism: for its use must have been frequent indeed, had the mode of proceeding adopted by our opposers been then practised. Besides, there would have been the greatest propriety in mentioning a circumstance of this kind, had pouring or sprinkling been the mode of administration; because it would have been a plain intimation that the term *baptism* was not to be understood in its primary and obvious, but in a secondary and remote acceptation. Of what importance was it for us to know, that our Lord *poured water into a basin*, before he performed the condescending act; in comparison with an explicit account of something similar, if any thing similar there had been, prior to the administration of baptism, and preparatory to it? How comes it that these expressions, or others equivalent; 'Peter, or Paul, or Philip (for instance) *poured water into a basin, and baptized such an one,*' are en-

\* John. xiii. f See Exod. xii. 22. & xxiv. 6.

tirely unknown to the New Testament? How came the inspired page to speak, not of *bafins*, but of *rovers*; not of a *little*, but of *much water*; not of *bringing* water to the candidate, but of his *going to*, and *into* the water; not of *wetting*, but of *burying*; when the administration and the design of the ordinance are described? Were one of our opponents to publish a history of his own practice, in regard to baptism, he must either use different language from that of inspiration, respecting this matter; or expose himself to a violent suspicion of having deserted the cause he once espoused. His character would certainly appear problematical among his brethren, and his conduct bear a dispute, whatever he might intend. If therefore the sacred Historians practised aspersion, their conduct as writers was extremely remarkable: for though, on that supposition, they set the example which our opposers follow, as to the mode of administration; yet, in their narrations, they adopt such expressions, and mention such circumstances relating to baptism, as would make a very singular figure from the pen of an English Pædobaptist, when describing his own conduct and views in reference to that institution.—Were my Reader to peruse a narrative of baptismal practice, penned by a foreigner, or by any anonymous author, of whom he had no knowledge but what was obtained from his writings;—were he to find him speak, of choosing a place for the administration of baptism, in preference to others, because there was *much water* there—of his baptizing in a *river*—of *going down* with the candidate *into*, and *coming up out of the water*;—were he to find him reminding baptized persons of their having been *buried* and *raised* with Christ in baptism; and were he to observe, that the author always uses a word for the ordinance,



ordinance, which, in its primary acceptation, signifies *immersion*, but never talks of *bringing water* to the candidate, or of using a *basin*, as preparatory to the administration; he would, I presume, be ready to say, ‘This author, whoever he be, writes like a Baptist.’ He speaks the language of one that considers baptism as nothing short of immersion. If, however, contrary to all appearances, he practised *aspersion*, and intended to inform the public of that particular, he has chosen a very singular method in which to do it, and has expressed himself in the ‘most awkward manner imaginable.’—Now, supposing the Apostles to have practised pouring, or sprinkling, it is highly reasonable for us to conclude, that the inspired penmen *intended* to inform us of it. But if so, how comes it that a serious and uniform adoption of their expressions, by an unknown author, respecting the administration and meaning of the sacred rite, is enough, to raise an immediate suspicion that he approves of *immersion*? And how comes it, that our present opposers never talk of going to a place where there is *much water*; of going *into* the water, and of *coming up out of* the water, when they speak of performing the solemn service? A similarity of *practice*, in other cases, usually produces a similarity of *language*, when that practice is narrated. This therefore is a presumptive evidence, that the apostolic practice was different from theirs. For while they avoid the use of this remarkable apostolic language, it looks as if they were conscious that it would not properly express the facts to which it should be applied.

To illustrate the point and confirm the argument, it may be observed, that when JUSTIN Martyr describes the manner of proceeding in his time, he  
speaks

speaks of the candidates being 'brought to a place of 'water \*,' that they might be baptized. A kind of language this which is not at all used, that I recollect, by Pædobaptists in our country. The ancient Apologist, however, saw reason for such expressions. Was it, then, because he *designed* to inform the Roman emperor how baptism was practised in those times? undoubtedly; and we have equal grounds to conclude, that the Apostles *intended* to inform posterity how baptism was administered by John, and by themselves. Is this phraseology of JUSTIN like that of the New Testament, in similar cases? none, with any appearance of reason, can deny it; and hence it has been inferred, that religious practice, in this respect, was the same in the second, as it was in the first century. What, then, has been the opinion of learned men concerning the mode of administration, as intimated in these remarkable words of the Martyr? they have, I think, universally understood him, as meaning to convey the idea of *immersion*. Mr. REEVEs, for instance, in his Note on this very passage, has the following words: 'It is evident from 'this place of JUSTIN, and that of TERTULLIAN, ' *De Cor. Mil.* C. III. that *ponds* and *river*s were the 'only baptisteries or founts the Church had for the 'first two hundred years†.—But whether the Apostles and JUSTIN administered the ordinance by plunging or sprinkling, one thing is plain; Various remarkable expressions, found in the writings of those Ancients relative to baptism, are seldom if ever used, in the same connection, by our opposers; though common enough among such as practise immersion. This reminds me of what is reported con-

\* Mr. REEVEs's *Apologies*, Vol. I. p. 105. Vid. BUNDES *Theol. Dogmat.* L. V. C. 1. § 5.

† Ibid.

concerning some Popish priests in Scotland, who imagined that the New Testament was composed by MARTIN LUTHER\*. A wild imagination, doubtless. It may be supposed to have arisen, however, from that similarity of sentiment and of expression, which they perceived to exist, between the apostolic writings and those of the great Reformer. Now as it is natural for persons to make use of language that is agreeable to their own religious practice; and as the obvious meaning, not only of JUSTIN's expressions, but of inspired phraseology, relating to baptism, is much more agreeable to the practice of plunging, than to that of pouring or sprinkling a little water upon the face; I cannot but think that both the Apologist and the Apostles constantly practised immersion.

That the principle of reasoning adopted in the two preceding paragraphs is not peculiar to us, appears by the following extract from Dr. WATERLAND; which, *mutatis mutandis*, will apply in the present case. 'The Arians—never use any expressions like  
'to some which they subscribe to. They will never  
'say from the press, or from the pulpit, or in common conversation, that Father, Son, and Holy  
'Ghost are *one God*; that they are *coequal, coeternal*,  
'and so on. They allow of these expressions as often  
'as they subscribe; but never else—Should any man  
'of them, in a treatise, or sermon, throw out any  
'such shocking assertions (shocking, I mean, to *them*)  
'he would be looked upon as a *deserter* by the party;  
'and a *betray*er of the cause which he had undertaken to defend†.'

\* MR. CLARKSON'S *Practical Div. of Popists*, p. 79.    † *Case of Arian Subscription*, p. 33.

REFLECT. IV. It has been sometimes objected, That there is no mention of any *change of raiment* at the administration of baptism; which must have taken place, and would probably have been mentioned, had immersion been the common practice. Various learned and eminent Pædobaptists have taught us, however, that in the apostolic Writings there are *plain allusions* to such change of raiment. See No. 54, 59, 61. But supposing no such allusive expressions to have been used, yet as the inspired Writers inform us, that John baptized our Lord *in, or into Jordan*; that Philip and the Eunuch *went down into the water*, and that the latter was *baptized*; we should not have wanted any further information respecting that affair. Who can doubt whether the Syrian leper changed his garments, when, according to the order of the man of God, he *dipped himself seven times in Jordan*, though the sacred Historian be silent as to that particular? Nor is any mention made of changing the raiment, that I recollect, either in the laws or in the history of legal purification by bathing, among the ancient Israelites: yet that mode of purification often occurs in the Old Testament\*.

REFLECT. V. To favour the cause of sprinkling, some Pædobaptists have given such a representation of the manner in which John performed the sacred rite as is quite ludicrous. Dr. GUISE, for instance, when speaking of the multitude baptized by our Lord's Harbinger, says; 'It seems therefore to me, that the  
' people stood *in ranks near to, or just within the edge*  
' *of the river*; and John passing along before them  
' *cast water* upon their heads or faces, with his hands, or

\* See Mr. MARTIN's *Letters to Mr. MORSEY*, p. 145, 146.

‘some proper instrument; by which means he might easily baptize many thousands in a day\*.’ Of this Mr. J. WESLEY has been the humble transcriber†; and Mr. ARCH. HALL gives Dr. GUISE’s Note the sanction of his express approbation‡. Mr. HORSEY also adopts the same view of the fact when he says; ‘I presume—that the multitude stood *in ranks* at the brink, or just within the edge of the river, while the administrator sprinkled or poured the *running* water upon them||.—Very different, however, is the following language of that eminent and learned Lutheran, BUDDEUS: ‘Though a great multitude was baptized by John, yet thence it does not follow that they could not be baptized by immersion; seeing nothing hinders but they might be baptized separately, one by one§.’—That so grave an author as Dr. GUISE should give such a puerile and farcical turn to the conduct of him who came in the spirit and power of Elijah, when administering a solemn ordinance of divine worship, is matter of wonder. Nor can I account for its being approved by others, but on a supposition that they feel themselves embarrassed, when attempting to reconcile their own practice with the natural and obvious meaning of what the Evangelists have said concerning John’s administration of the rite. If, however, the credit of sprinkling cannot be supported without burlesquing the Sacred History, and exposing in this manner one of the most exalted human characters to the ridicule of Infidels, it ought for ever to sink in oblivion. But what will not the love of hypothesis do, when cherished by any writer!

\* Note, on Matt. iii. 6. † Note, on Matt. iii. 6. Compare No. 18.

‡ *Gospel Worship*, Vol. I. p. 271. || *Inf. Rep. Stated and Defended*, p. 20. § *Theolog. Dogmat. L. V. C. i.* § 5.

To justify my censures, the following things be considered.

This account of the fact represents him who was more than a prophet, as less than a man—represents him, who was all severity in his manners, and all solemnity in his ministry, as acting the part of a playful boy. According to these authors there was not half the solemnity in John's baptism, which there is in that annual festival of the Romish Church, which is called *The Benediction of Horses*. Concerning the latter Dr. MIDDLETON says; 'It is always celebrated with much solemnity in the month of January; when all the inhabitants of the city and neighbourhood send up their horses, asses, and so on, to the Convent of St. Anthony, near St. Mary the Great: where a priest in his surplice at the church-door *sprinkles with his brush* all the animals singly, as they are presented to him, and receives from each owner a gratuity proportionable to his zeal and ability. Amongst the rest, I had my own horses blest at the expence of about eighteen-pence of our money; as well to satisfy my own curiosity, as to humour the coachman†.'—Whether Dr. GURSE, and those who follow him in this particular, imagine the son of Zachariàs to have used his naked hand, a scoop, a squirt, a brush, or a bunch of hyssop, I cannot say; though the last, I think, is most likely, on the principle of Mr. HORSEY's reasoning\*. This, however, is clear: The priest of superstition

† In *Conformity of Ancient and Modern Cerem.* Pref. p. 5, 6.

\* Mr. GAY has mentioned another instrument that is well fitted to sprinkle a multitude expeditiously. These are his words,

'When dext'rous damsels twirl the *sprinkling mop*.'

See Dr. JOHNSON's *Dict.* under the verb SPRINKLE. Whether this was the instrument used by John, we leave our opposers to judge.  
But

superstition in his white surplice appears to act with more care and more solemnity, than the servant of God in his hairy garment. The former, though paid for his labour at so much *per head*, cautiously *sprinkles the cattle one by one*: the latter, though mortified to secular gain, burning with zeal for God, and full of love to the souls of men, being all in a hurry to finish his business, *casts water* on half a dozen or half a score at a time. Of this haste, it may be supposed, the consequence was, that the water was very unequally divided among the candidates. How many *deep* the ranks were, our authors indeed have not informed us; but according to them there must have been more than *one* rank, because they speak in the plural. It is plain, therefore, that the front rank must have had the most copious application of the liquid element: while many individuals, we may justly suppose, that were further distant from the administrator, had little or none at all.—This presumed conduct of John, considered in one view, presents us with a *mercenary drudge* in the service of God, who cares not how slovenly the solemnities of holy worship are performed, provided they do but appear in full tale: in another, with a *wanton boy*, who makes himself sport by squirting water upon all that are near him: in every view, not only with something quite inimical to the character of

\* But how strange it is to hear of *casting* water on the head or the face with an *instrument*! It leads one to think, rather of a Pagan priest, than of the Messiah's harbinger—of ancient Heathenism, rather than Christian baptism. For an account of the *Affergilla*, or instruments of sprinkling, used in the rites of Paganism, LOMFIERUS *De Vet. Gent. Lustrat. Syntag.* Cap. xxxv. may be consulted; but whether the Reader must have recourse for intelligence concerning the *affergillum* of John, or of any Apostle, I confess myself entirely ignorant: because the only authors that mention it, have not condescended to give us the least description of it.

John,

# CHAP. IV.] *The following Ages.*

John, but also to the solemn and gracious import of that ordinance which he administered.\* But, as the learned CHAMIER observes, 'there is nothing so extraordinary, nothing so unusual, nothing so obscure, that is not urged by one or another against a divine appointment\*.'—Dr. HAMMOND informs us, that the manner of immersing proselytes among the Jews 'is said to be, that they should sit in water *up to the neck*;' and in that situation 'learn some of the precepts of the law, both hard and easy†.' Now, after such a representation of John's baptism, who could have imagined these very authors to consider it as originating in the proselyte bathing? yet so it is!

*The people stood in RANKS, near to, or just within the edge of the river; and John passing before them CAST water upon their heads or faces.* But had this been a fact there is reason to think it would have been mentioned: because, when our Lord miraculously fed five thousand men with a few loaves and fishes, we are expressly told that the hungry multitude were seated *in ranks*‡. As John was the first administrator of baptism, and as his example, in the use of water, was to be a pattern for the church in following ages; it was apparently of much more importance for us to have been informed, had it been a fact, that the people were *baptized* when standing in ranks, than it was to be told in what position the five thousand were placed, when they partook of miraculous food. Because the former concerned a standing ordinance of New Testament worship: the latter, it is plain, was an extraordinary and transient fact. Yet, the sacred Historians have not said a word about the

\* *Passat.* Tom. IV. L. VIII. C. vi. § 28.  
 Matt. iii. 1.

† Mark vi. 40.

‡ *Note, on*



people *standing* in ranks while John baptized them, though *sitting* in ranks be so plainly mentioned respecting the miracle.—It may be observed also in regard to the latter case, that a great multitude were to be served by a few disciples, and to be fed when the day was far advanced. Expedition, therefore, was highly necessary, that the people might be refreshed, and afterward go to their own habitations. In reference to this affair, the idea of *expedition* forces itself upon us; but not at all, in regard to John baptizing a multitude, further than was consistent with deep solemnity; for it is no where said, that he baptized them all in a day. What then would serious readers have thought, if Dr. GUISE had represented Jesus Christ as giving his disciples the broken loaves and the divided fishes to *fling* among the ranks, and leave the hungry thousands to scramble for them? I cannot help supposing, that they would have execrated the representation as a vile impeachment of our Lord's conduct, and as worthy of a WOOLSTON, rather than a GUISE. My Reader will apply this to the case before us.

Again: Do any of our opponents imagine that our Lord, standing in one of these ranks, was baptized by having a little water *cast* upon him in this random way? Or do they suppose that John baptized him in a singular manner? Few, I think, will assert the former; and as to the latter there is no appearance of evidence. For, are we informed that the people of Judea and of Jerusalem were all baptized by John *in the river Jordan*? we are assured by the same authority, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John *in Jordan* \*. Such is the testi-

\* Mark i. 5, 9. Matt. iii. 6.

mony of Matthew and of Mark; with which the language of sacred history in the Old Testament, given by the Seventy, may be compared. Of Naaman it is written; *Then went he down and dipped himself, εβαπτισατο, seven times in Jordan\**. With equal reason therefore might we suppose, that the Syrian general went only to the brink, or just within the edge of Jordan, and there cast water upon his head or his face; as adopt the imagination of these authors, respecting the manner of John's proceeding.—When the Seventy interpreters express the idea of coming to Jordan, their words are, *εως του Ιορδανου†*: when they convey the notion of standing BY Jordan, they use the terms *επι του Ιορδανου‡*: and when they represent a person standing upon the brink, or just within the edge of Jordan, their language is, *επι του χειλους του Ιορδανου§*. But when the Evangelists mention Jordan, in connection with John's baptizing, they represent him as performing the rite *εν τω Ιορδανη, IN Jordan*; or as baptizing *εις τον Ιορδανην, INTO Jordan||*. As coming to the brink of Jordan, and being in that river, are manifestly different situations; so they are plainly distinguished in the Septuagint. *When ye are come to the brink, επι μερους, of the water of Jordan, ye shall stand still εν Ιορδανη, IN JORDAN¶*. So in the history of the Ethiopian Eunuch it is written, *As they went on their way they came to a certain water, επι τι υδωρ*; which is an approach to the brink: but when the act of baptizing was to be performed, *they went down both into the water, εις το υδωρ, both Philip and the Eunuch\*\**;

\* 2 Kings v. 14. † 2 Sam. xix. 15. 2 Kings vi. 2. and vii. 15. ‡ 2 Kings ii. 7. § 2 Kings ii. 13. || Matt. iii. 6. Mark i. 9. ¶ Josh. iii. 8. \*\* Acts viii. 36; 38.

which, doubtless, expresses an idea somewhat different from the Eunuch standing *on the brink, or just within the edge* of the water, that Philip might *cast* a few drops upon his head or his face.

Or, if the sacred Historians designed to inform us, that our Lord accompanied John into Jordan that he might be baptized by having a little water, not *cast* in his face, but *poured* upon his head; how comes it that none of them says a word about that memorable, solemn, and significant *pouring*? It is manifest they were not so sparing in their narratives on other occasions, though of much less importance to our instruction, and to the purity of a divine institution. Is ointment *poured* on the head of our Lord, once and again? it is expressly mentioned by those very Evangelists who represent him as baptized *in Jordan* \*. Yet none can doubt that it was of much greater moment for us to know, in what manner he was baptized; than it was precisely to be informed, how two godly women applied their costly ointment to his sacred Person.

*The people stood in ranks, near to, or just within the edge of the river; and John passing before them, cast water upon their heads or faces.* Such, according to these authors, was the truly primitive mode of proceeding! But if any of our opposers really believe this, why do they not imitate an example of such antiquity and so well recommended? Why, when called to administer baptism, do they not go to a river, or some collection of water, place the candidate on the brink, and then, standing in the liquid element, *cast* some of it upon his head or his face? This would be a compliance with what these authors consider as ori-

\* Matt. xxvi. 7. Mark xiv. 3.

*ginal practice.*—It may be observed, however, that their own representation of John's proceedings does not give us a very strong idea of his baptizing infants. For mere infants could not *stand* in ranks, either on the brink, or just within the edge of Jordan. Were they then *laid* in ranks? our opposers, I think, will not assert it. They, it may be presumed, if present for the purpose of being baptized, must have been held in the arms; of which, nevertheless, there is no mention. Nor could the administrator take them into his arms one by one; for that, according to this representation, his expedition in baptizing multitudes would not permit. If therefore he sprinkled infants along with adults, it must have been while they were in the arms of their parents, or of their friends; of which there is no intimation, or shadow of probability. It is to be feared, therefore, that this remarkable anecdote of primitive sprinkling, of which some Pædobaptists are so fond, has a tendency to exclude infants from a share in the rite. However, be that as it may, for any of our Protestant Dissenting Brethren to fix the idea of original example in opposition to us, and *never to imitate* that example, has but an awkward look; as it is too much like the conduct of Roman Catholics, respecting the holy supper. Whoever believes the divine mission of John, cannot have any just reason to be ashamed of doing as he did, in regard to the use of baptismal water. Yet were I informed that Mr. HORSEY, for instance, frequently goes *into a river*, merely to sprinkle an infant, or an adult; I should certainly impeach, either the *credibility* of my information, or the *intellects* of the administrator. Nor would a consideration of all I have read in Mr. HORSEY's Discourse, concerning John being *the son of a priest*, concerning *legal purifications*.

*fications, and running water, at all relieve my anxiety about the punctuality of my informant, or the sanity of my friend. Because when John baptized it was, not as the son of a priest, but as the forerunner of Christ; not as influenced by Jewish customs, but as feeling the force of divine authority. Besides, were it granted that mere water was ever sprinkled with a view to legal purification, which nevertheless cannot be proved; it would be as hard to evince, that the Jewish priests went into a river to sprinkle the running water, as it would be to demonstrate that they purified any person by plunging him in water. Nor, among all the laws of ceremonial purification, do I recollect one, that enjoined pouring water on the head, or sprinkling it on the face: much less, that the officiating priest should thus apply the liquid element, when standing on the brink, or just within the edge of a stream.*

It may perhaps be said; John chose a river for the purpose of sprinkling, not only because it was *running* water, but also on account of the *multitude* that came to his baptism; and therefore his example in entering a river does not, in common cases, oblige. So the Roman Catholics tell us, that in primitive times, when the sacred supper was administered to a small number of communicants, they might all partake of the cup without inconvenience: but afterward, when communicants became numerous, it was necessary to make an alteration in that particular.—The futility of this plea will further appear if it be considered, that a basin, or a pail, would have contained a sufficient quantity of water for the sprinkling of great numbers. See No. 69. Besides, we are informed that when Philip baptized a single individual, both he and the candidate *went into the water*. Were Mr. HORSLEY,

SEY, therefore, to act upon that representation of John's baptism which he has given, I cannot help thinking that serious Pædobaptist spectators would find themselves in a predicament not much different from that of the poet;

- ' To laugh, were want of goodness and of grace ;
- ' And to be grave exceeds all power of face.'

If our Lord's Harbinger discovered no more solemnity and caution in hearing a profession of repentance made by the candidates, and in declaring by what authority and for what purposes they were to be baptized, than these our opponents represent him as having when he used the water; there was, we may venture to conclude, but little appearance of his baptism being *from Heaven*, or of much devotion subsisting in his heart. The love of hypothesis must surely be very great, when it impels godly and sensible men to seek a refuge for their cause in such extravagant fancies as these. But, as Mr. AINSWORTH observes, ' when men are prest with express Scripture, and yet are resolved (cost what will) to adhere to their own conclusions, it is advisable to cast about, to turn their thoughts into all shapes imaginable, to hunt for the extremest possibilities. If a word, a phrase, an expression, is but capable of another sense, let it be probable or improbable, true or false, agreeable to the scope of the place, or alien, all is a case; something must be said, that they may not seem to say nothing: and if they can say, *It is possible it may be otherwise*, (as who cannot?) though they do not believe themselves, they hug themselves for their ready wit, and applaud themselves for grave respondents \*.'

\* *Antifozzo*, p. 549, 550.

**REFLECT. VI.** The baptism of the *three thousand*\*, has been frequently pleaded as a presumptive evidence in favour of pouring, or of sprinkling. The Roman Catholics also imagine that they find a warrant in the same fact, for persons who do not bear the ministerial character to administer baptism, when a supposed necessity urges; because they conclude that the Apostles could not baptize so great a number in so short a time†. Agreeable to which is the following language of Mr. FERDINANDO SHAW: ‘Many learned men are of opinion that the believers, the brethren, lay-christians, assisted the Apostles in baptizing them; without which it is hard to be conceived how it could be done in so short a time‡.’ One very learned, sagacious, and impartial writer already quoted, (No. 76) frankly acknowledges, that the passage is far from affording an argument against immersion; to whom I will now add a few more Pædobaptists. Thus then Mr. MARCHANT: ‘The only question is, how such a multitude of converts could be baptized in one day? To which some reply, that this rite of initiation into the Christian church was then performed by way of sprinkling, as it is among us: but whoever looks into history will find, that the form of baptism among the Jews was plunging the whole body under water; and that in conformity to them, the primitive Christians did, and the Eastern church even to this day does administer that sacrament in this manner. There is no necessity therefore for us to suppose, that all those proselytes to the Christian faith were baptized in one day. St. Luke delivers in the gross, what might possibly be

\* Acts ii. 41.

C. XIII. § 13.

Edit. 2d.

† FORBESII *Instruct. Hist. Theol.* L. X.‡ *Valid. of Bap. by Dissent. Ministers*, p. 92.

‘transacted at several times\*.’ **BUDDEQs**: ‘When those three thousand persons that were brought to repentance in one day, by the preaching of Peter, were to be baptized, they were led to another place; and might be baptized [i. e. immersed] by the Apostles, by others in company with them, and also by the seventy disciples. For though Luke has not mentioned this, yet we cannot thence infer that it is not a fact: seeing many circumstances are frequently omitted for the sake of brevity†.’ **Bp. WILSON**: ‘*The same day*: i. e. at that time, on account of that sermon; though they might not all be baptized in one day, but were at that time converted‡.’ **Bp. TAYLOR**: ‘**AQUINAS** supposes the Apostles did so, [that is, used sprinkling instead of immersion] when the three thousand, and when the five thousand, were at once converted and baptized. But this is but a conjecture, and hath no tradition and no record to warrant it§.’ **BOSSUET**: ‘It appears not that the three thousand and the five thousand, mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, who were converted at the first sermons of St. Peter, were baptized any other way [than by immersion;] and the great numbers of those converts is no proof that they were baptized by sprinkling, as some have conjectured. For, besides that nothing obliges us to say that they were all baptized on the same day; •tis certain that St. John the Baptist, who baptized no less numbers, seeing all Judea flocked to him, baptized no other way than by dipping: and his example shows us, that to baptize a great number of people those places were chosen where there was abundance of water. Add to this, that the baths

\* *Exh. sit.* in loc.

† Note in loc.

‡ *Theolog. Dogmat.* I. V. C. i. § 5.

§ *Dust. Dub.* B. III. Ch. iv. p. 644.



‘and purifications of the ancients rendered this ceremony easy and familiar at that time\*.’

People who are but little accustomed to cold bathing, either for amusement, for medical purposes, or with religious views, may wonder how such multitudes could be accommodated, if they were immersed in water; but when it is considered that this was done at Jerusalem, where immersion was quite familiar, and must by the laws of Judaism be daily practised, not only there, but in all parts of the country, their amazement will cease. For, as Bp. PATRICK observes, ‘There are so many washings prescribed [in the law of Moses,] that it is reasonable to believe, there were not only at Jerusalem and in all other cities, but in every village several bathing places contrived for these legal purifications, that men might without much labour be capable to fulfil these precepts†.’ Thus also D’ OUTREINUS: ‘Whoever considers the number of unclean persons, who daily had need of washing, and he who reads the Talmudic Treatises concerning purifications, and collections of water convenient for those purposes, will be easily persuaded, that Bethesda and other pools at Jerusalem subserved that design‡.’

Again: We are informed by the sacred Historian, that when king Solomon dedicated his magnificent temple, *he offered two and twenty thousand oxen, and a hundred and twenty thousand sheep*. Now supposing a Deist were to question the truth of this historical fact, on account of the great number of animals that were offered; it would soon be replied by our opponents themselves, A great number of priests were em-

\* In Mr. STENNETT'S *Answer to Mr. RUSSEN*, p. 175, 176.

† On Lev. xv. 12,

‡ *Biblioth. Bremens.* Class. I. p. 614.

ployed; nor was the work performed in one day\*. Why then may not a similar answer suffice in the present case?—All the Jewish males were enjoined by divine law to appear before the Lord in Jerusalem three times in a year. Now it may be asked, How could that metropolis contain such multitudes as came up from all parts of the country, at each of their grand festivals? Though far from thinking this difficulty insurmountable, yet I am persuaded that it is full as easy to account for the three thousand being immersed in one day; as it is to conceive how such a prodigious concourse of strangers were accommodated with lodgings, in the city and suburbs of Jerusalem. But as, in the one case, there is no necessity of supposing that the strangers were turned into the fields to sleep with cattle†; so, in the other, there is no occasion to imagine that plunging was converted into sprinkling.

Further: Were the method\* of arguing adopted by our opposers with reference to this passage legitimate, and their inference valid, it might be rendered highly probable that the first instance of circumcision was performed, not by *cutting off* the foreskin, but by making a *slight incision* in that pellicle. For Moses assures us that Abraham circumcised himself and his son Ishmael, together with all the males that were born in his house and bought with his money, on the very same day that he received the divine order‡. We are also informed by the sacred Historian, that long before Abraham received the command of circumcision, he had *three hundred and eighteen* male servants, who were *born in his own house*, and able to bear

\* See Mr. MARTIN's *Letters to Mr. HORSEY*, p. 150, 151.

† See Dr. JENNINGS's *Jewish Antiq.* Vol. II. p. 169, 170.

‡ Gen. xvii. 23, 24.

and consequently, it is highly probable the whole number of males that were born in his house and then living, was four hundred or upwards; besides those that were *bought with his money*, concerning the number of whom we have no information. Nor is there any reason to think that his household was diminished, but rather increased, when he obeyed the heavenly mandate under consideration.—Now if we may estimate the time required for circumcising four or five hundred persons, by the time spent, exclusive of devotional exercises, when the modern Jews perform the same rite upon an infant; we may safely consider the difficulty as much greater in the case of Abraham circumcising his numerous household in one day, than that which attends the immersion of three thousand. For by an instance of circumcision which the author saw performed, he cannot help thinking that the time employed in merely cutting off the foreskin and taking care of the part with a view to its healing, would have sufficed for the solemn immersion of at least four persons†. It must indeed be admitted as exceedingly probable, that the precautions used by Abraham to abate the pain and to heal the part, were different from those of the modern Jews in similar cases: but some care, doubtless, must have been *immediately* necessary, supposing the præputium of each to have been cut off; especially with regard to grown persons in that hot country. But how to account for one man doing all this in a single day, I do not perceive. The difficulty will increase if it be admitted, as I think it ought, that Abraham set the first example in his own person: for as there is no intimation of any thing

\* Gen. xiv. 14.  
and Customs of the Jews, Part. IV. Chap. viii.

† See Læo Modena's *Hist. of the Rites*

# CHAP. IV.] *The Circumcision in following Ages.* 239

miraculous on that occasion, the soreness and the pain must greatly incommode him, while performing the rite upon others. On the principle of reasoning here opposed we might therefore infer, That the venerable Patriarch did not *cut off*, but only made a *trifling incision* in the part specified. But whatever difficulties may attend speculation upon the fact, I have not heard that any of the Jews ever doubted whether their great progenitor performed a real circumcision upon the males of his very numerous household; nor that they ever declined an imitation of original example, on account of any inconveniences which attended it. See CHAP. II. REFLECT. IX. —It may perhaps be said; There is no necessity to conclude, that the hoary Patriarch himself circumcised all the males of his numerous family; because he might be said to do what was performed by his order. To which it may be replied; The record of the fact expressly marks both the performer and the time; nor will it, I conceive, admit of such an interpretation. For it is written, *Abraham took Ishmael his son, and all that were born in his house, and all that were bought with his money, every male among the men of Abraham's house, and circumcised the flesh of their foreskin in the self same day, as God had said unto him.* Now it is plain that this language ascribes to Abraham the whole performance of the rite, exclusive of any assistant: for it was the Patriarch himself who *took* Ishmael, and *every male* in his house, and *circumcised* them. That all this was performed by Abraham in one day, we have no doubt; because the fact rests upon divine testimony: but that speculation when employed upon it is embarrassed, except we admit of a trifling incision instead of a circumcision, must I think be acknowledged. When our opposers, therefore,

fore, have clearly accounted for the aged Patriarch circumcising four or five hundred persons in one day; they will not be much at a loss to conceive of twelve Apostles and seventy disciples immersing three thousand in the same space of time.

That three thousand should be solemnly immersed at such a place as Jerusalem, and at a time when, as the sacred Historian remarks, the disciples *had favour with all the people*; even supposing them all to have been baptized in one day; is not half so strange as various accounts relating to facts of the same nature, that we find in the page of history. Thus, for example, Mr. MARCHANT: ‘Peter [and his companions in the ministry] ‘baptizing in one day three thousand persons by immersion, need not be wondered at; since we read in <sup>\*</sup>the authentic life of GREGORY, the Apostle of the ‘Armenians; that he baptized *twelve thousand* together, by immersion, in the river Euphrates: which <sup>\*</sup>ISAAC, the patriarch of that nation, confirms in his ‘first invective <sup>\*</sup>.’ Mr. BINGHAM: ‘PALLADIUS ‘observes, in the life of St. CHRYSOSTOM, that at ‘Constantinople *three thousand* persons were baptized ‘at once, upon one of [their] greater festivals †.’ Dr. J. G. KINE: ‘WOLODIMER, a Russian prince— ‘was baptized by the name of BASILIUS;—and it ‘is said *twenty thousand* of his subjects were baptized ‘the same day ‡.’ Mr. JOHN FOXE informs us that AUSTIN, the Monk, ‘baptized and christened *ten thousand* Saxons, or Angles, in the West river that ‘is called Swale, beside York, on a Christmas day §.’ Dr. ROBERTSON: ‘A single clergyman baptized in ‘one day above *five thousand* Mexicans, and did not

<sup>\*</sup> *Exposit. on Matt. iii. 7.*      † *Origines Eccles. B. XI. Chap. vi.*  
 § 9.      ‡ *Rites and Cerem. of Greek Church, P. 4.*      § *Acts and Mon. under A. D. 602.*

‘desist till he was so exhausted by fatigue, that he was  
‘unable to lift up his hands\*.’ Nay, SALMERO  
ferts (with what credibility the Reader will judge)  
that ‘FRANCIS XAVIER, among the Indians, bap-  
‘tized *fifteen thousand* in one day.’ Upon which the  
learned CHAMIER pertinently asks, ‘Could fifteen  
‘thousand be baptized by one person; and might not  
‘three thousand be baptized by many †?’—Respect-  
ing the administration of baptism Dr. DODDRIDGE  
says; I think ‘the office was generally assigned to in-  
‘feriors, as requiring no extraordinary abilities, and  
‘as being attended with some trouble and inconve-  
‘nience; especially where immersion was used, as I  
‘suppose it often, though not constantly, was ‡.’ That  
persons much inferior to the Apostles in office and  
gifts were sometimes employed by them to baptize  
those who professed faith, we have no doubt: but that  
it was because of any *trouble* or *inconvenience* which  
attended the administration, we do not believe; nay,  
we consider such an idea as unworthy the character  
of those laborious and self-denying Ambassadors of  
Christ.

Our opponents however seem to forget that the  
principal difficulty, in regard to *time*, does not lie in  
such a multitude being *baptized*, whether by plunging  
or otherwise; but in their making a *satisfactory pro-  
fession* of repentance and faith. For the three thou-  
sand were adults; and our opposers agree, that all  
adults, previous to baptism, should make such a pro-  
fession. It is much easier to conceive of their being  
immersed in the course of a day, by such a number  
of administrators, and with such conveniences as were

\* *Hist. of South America*, Vol. II. p. 384. Quarto. † *Pen-  
sées*, Tom. IV. L. V. C. xiv. § 39. ‡ *Note*, on 1 Cor. i. 16.  
Vid. TURRETT, *Institut.* Loc. XIX. Quæst. XIV. § 11.

then at Jerusalem; than it is to imagine how those administrators could receive a profession of faith in the Son of God, from each of the candidates, in an equal space of time. I may here venture an appeal to Pædobaptist ministers, Whether, when adults apply for baptism, they do not spend more time in hearing a declaration of the grounds of their faith and hope, than they themselves would think necessary for the solemn immersion of such candidates, a river, a pond, or a baptistery being at hand? The passage before us therefore might be adduced with much more appearance of argument, in opposition to the necessity of personally professing faith previous to baptism; than it can in favour of pouring or of sprinkling.—But why should our opposers raise an objection which, as Mr. MARTIN observes, if it have any force, militates against the idea of pouring, as well as of plunging? For as but one person could be baptized at once, and as the same form of words must have been used at the baptism of each; the difference in respect of time between their being plunged, and having water poured or sprinkled upon them, must be considered as very small. Besides, according to another branch of that hypothesis which we oppose, it seems as if many of these three thousand must have had their children sprinkled in the same space of time; which will greatly increase the number, and more than counterbalance the extra time required for immersion.—Should it be objected, There is no occasion for supposing that the children of those believers were baptized on the *same* day: it may be replied, Neither does Luke say that the three thousand were *baptized*, but *added* to the church, the same day. Besides, an objection of that kind would be a departure from their usual way of stating the matter: for they have often told us, that  
infants

infants were baptized *along with their parents*; and it is full as likely that those children whose parents were among the three thousand should be baptized at the same time, as that the Jailor's infants, if he had any, should have their sweet repose disturbed by being baptized at *midnight*. Yet this their argument from the latter of these facts implies.—I will add a remark of Mr. DITTON's: 'If the evidence be good, says he, by all the laws of human nature, I do not care for ten thousand difficulties, if they were ever so insuperable; provided they are not such as infer simple impossibility, or palpable absurdity \*.'

Once more: Supposing it appeared with indisputable evidence, that the three thousand were baptized by pouring or sprinkling; yet, according to Protestant Pædobaptists, it would not prove the lawfulness of such an administration in common practice; except it appeared to agree with divine law, or to have been the appointment of Christ. For this was undoubtedly an *extraordinary* case; and learned Pædobaptists assure us, when disputing with Roman Catholics about the sacred supper, That a scriptural example in an extraordinary instance, must not be considered as the rule of general conduct. Thus Mr. STEELE: 'The relation of an example in an extraordinary case, [is not] sufficient to cancel a direct precept and clear example with it†.' CHEMNITIUS thus: 'A general rule must not be taken from extraordinary examples;—for that should be derived from the institution of the sacraments‡.' Mr. PAYNE, in answer to an argument

\* *Discourse on the Resurrection of Christ*, Part III. Sect. lxix.

† *Morning Exercise against Popery*, p. 774.

‡ *Exam. Concil.*

*Trident.* p. 216. *Vid.* p. 327.



of the Papists for communion is one kind, which is drawn from supposed instances of such a practice in the ancient church, thus reasons: 'What will this signify, [could it be proved,] to the justifying the constant and public communions in one kind, when there are no such particular or extraordinary reasons for it?—The doing this, is as if the Jews, because whilst they were in the wilderness they could not so well observe the precept of circumcision, and so were at that time for a particular reason excused from it, should ever after have omitted it as unnecessary—This, sure, had been making too bold with a positive precept, although there might be a particular case, or instance, wherein it was not so exactly to be observed—David's eating the show-bread, which it was not lawful but for the priests ordinarily to eat, is approved by our Saviour; not upon the account of tradition, or the judgment of the high-priest, but the extreme hunger which he and his companions were then pressed with, and which made it lawful for them to eat of the hallowed bread, when there was no other to be procured. But did this make it lawful afterwards for the high-priest, or the Sanhedrim, to have made the holy bread always common to others when there was no such necessity\*?'

REFLECT. VII. If the numerous and learned authors, in the beginning of this Chapter, be not under a gross mistake, with regard to apostolic practice; my Reader has reason to be surprised, offended, shocked, at the following reflection which is cast on immersion: because he cannot but perceive it fall on some of the most venerable and excellent persons that ever appeared in the world. 'To baptize *naked*, or *next to naked*, (which

\* *Preserv. against Popery*, Title vii. p. 124, 149.

'is supposed, and GENERALLY practised in immersion) is against the law of modesty; and to do such a thing in public solemn assemblies, is so far from being tolerable, that it is abominable, to every chaste soul: and especially to baptize *women* in this manner\*.'—When perusing the Treatise I came at these words, I paused, I was astonished, I was almost confounded. What, thought I, is this the language of the amiable and excellent Mr. HENRY! Immersion SUPPOSE the subject of the ordinance NAKED, OR NEXT to naked! This PRACTISED, GENERALLY practised, practised in PUBLIC SOLEMN ASSEMBLIES, and that upon WOMEN too! Where have you been, ye sons of sensuality! that you have not crowded around our baptisteries, when we have immersed any of the fair sex? How many fine opportunities have you missed, of feasting your lascivious eyes and exulting in the wonderful sight! And what are you about, ye Infidels! ye who laugh at every thing sacred, and take a malignant pleasure in exposing Christianity to ridicule! what, I again ask, are ye about, that you have not published our praise for gratifying your enmity to the religion of Jesus Christ! For on the word of an Author, who has long been held in a high degree of esteem by the religious public, we have often committed the most enormous outrage—I will not say, on the *solemnities of religion*, because you do not regard them—but, on the *laws of decorum*, and on the *modest feelings* of the tender sex; even while professing to act by the authority and example of Christ. What, are ye silent, *all* silent on such an interesting occasion; while the pen of a Christian Minister, of a sacred Ex-

\* Mr. MATT. HENRY'S *Treatise on Baptism*, p. 138, 139.

260 *Practice of the Apostles*, and of [PART IV] positor, and of a Protestant Dissenting BAPTIST, is thus officiously employed! *This*, ah! *this*—but I forbear; and shall only add a salutary prohibition, a gentle reprehension, and a candid extenuation. THOU SHALT NOT BEAR FALSE WITNESS AGAINST THY NEIGHBOUR; is the prohibition of JEHOVAH, the God of Israel. ‘We ought to DISOWN and show a DISLIKE of the PROPHANE SCOFFS which some people give to the English Antipædobaptists, merely for their use of DIPPING;’ is the reprehension of Dr. WALL, the Episcopalian. See No. 96. *I wot that THROUGH IGNORANCE ye did it*; is the extenuation of Peter the Apostle, when the most unjustifiable conduct was under his notice.

I will now subjoin the remark of a Pædobaptist writer upon this passage of Mr. HENRY. ‘*This cautionary against immersion*, says one of the Monthly Reviewers, might possibly have had some grounds in the practice of a few enthusiasts in the last age. Mr. BAXTER uses almost the same words, when speaking of the indecency, as well as the danger, of administering baptism by immersion, as Mr. HENRY; and indeed the latter appears to have copied from him. The reflection, however, should by no means be extended to the general practice of the Antipædobaptists; especially those of modern times. We almost question if it *ever* had a foundation: we are *certain* it hath none at present\*.’——It has, indeed, been supposed by many of the learned, and there seems to be some evidence of it, that the Ancients did sometimes administer the ordinance to persons of both sexes, *in puris naturalibus*: against this, however, the famous VOETIUS has entered his

\* *Monthly Review*, for Sep. 1784, p. 237.

protest,

CHAP. I. *The Church in following Ages.*

protest, as a mistake of the moderns, and a misrepresentation of ancient practice\*. But, admitting the fact, all whom I have observed agree, that a becoming decorum was constantly observed, as far as the nature of the case would permit. Thus, for instance, Dr. WALL: ‘They took great care for preserving the  
‘ modesty of any woman that was to be baptized.  
‘ There was none but women came near, or in sight,  
‘ till she was undressed, and her body in the water:  
‘ then the priest came, and putting her head also under water, used the form of words. Then he departed, and the women took her out of the water,  
‘ and clothed her again in white garments†.’

Those who have read the writings of Dr. FEATLEY, and of Messrs. BAXTER, WILLS, RUSSEN, BURKITT, and various others, in vindication of Pædobaptism, cannot be ignorant, that the Baptists have been frequently treated in the most illiberal manner. I will here present the Reader with an extract from the famous Mr. BAXTER, and leave the impartial to judge, whether it be the language of calm reason, of authenticated fact, and of Christian charity; or the clamour of prejudice, the distortion of misrepresentation, and the raving of a persecuting temper. Thus, then, Mr. BAXTER: ‘My sixth argument shall be  
‘ against the usual manner of their baptizing, as it is  
‘ by dipping over head in a river, or other cold water—  
‘ That which is a plain breach of the sixth commandment, *Thou shalt not kill*, is no ordinance of God,  
‘ but a most heinous sin. But the ordinary practice

\* Apud WILSIUM, *OEcon.* L. IV. C. xvi. § 14. † *Hist. Inf. Bap.* Part II. Chap. ix. § 3. Vid. VOSSIIUM, *Disputat. de Bap.* Disput. I. Thef. vi, vii, viii. and Mr. BINGHAM’s *Origines Ecclesiast.* B. XI. Chap. xi. § 1, 2, 3.

of baptizing over head in cold water, ~~is~~ necessary,  
 is a plain breach of the sixth commandment. There-  
 fore it is no ordinance of God, but an heinous sin.  
 And as Mr. CRADOCK in his book of *Gospel Liberty*  
 shews, the magistrate *ought to restrain it*, to save the  
 lives of his subjects—That this is *flat murder*, and  
 no better, being ordinarily and generally used, is un-  
 deniable to any understanding man—And I know  
 not what trick a covetous landlord can find out to get  
 his tenants to die apace, that he may have new fines  
 and heriots, likelier than to encourage such preachers,  
 that he may get them all to turn Anabaptists. I wish  
 that *this device* be not it that countenanceth these  
 men. And covetous physicians, methinks, should  
 not be much against them. Catarrhs and obstruc-  
 tions, which are the two great fountains of most  
 mortal diseases in man's body, could scarce have a  
 more notable means to produce them where they  
 are not, or to increase them where they are. Apo-  
 plexies, lethargies, palsies, and all comatous diseases,  
 would be promoted by it. So would cephalalgies, he-  
 micranies, phthises, debility of the stomach, crudities,  
 and almost all fevers, dysenteries, diarrheas, colics,  
 iliac passions, convulsions, spasms, tremors, and so  
 on. All hepatic, splenetic, pulmoniac persons, and  
 hypochondriacs, would soon have enough of it. In a  
 word, it is good for nothing but to dispatch men out of  
 the world that are burdensome, and to ranken church  
 yards—I conclude, if murder be a sin, then dipping  
 ordinarily in cold water over head, in England, is a  
 sin: and if those that would make it men's religion  
 to murder themselves, and urge it on their consciences  
 as their duty, are *not to be suffered* in a common  
 wealth, any more than *highway murderers*; then  
 judge how these Anabaptists, that teach the necessity  
 of

‘ of such dipping, are to be suffered.—My *argument* is also against another wickedness, in their manner of baptizing, which is their dipping persons *naked*, as is *very usual* with many of them; or *next* to naked, as is usual with the modestest that I have heard of.—If the minister must go into the water with the party,—it will certainly tend to his *death*; though they may scape that go in but once—Would not vain young men come to a baptizing to see the nakedness of maids, and make a mere jest and sport of it \* ?’—Were this representation just, we should have no reason to wonder if his following words expressed a fact: ‘ I am still more confirmed, that a visible judgment of God doth still follow Anabaptistry where ever it comes †.’ Compare CHAP. III. No. 4. and No. 60. of this CHAP. It was not without reason, I perceive, that Mr. BAXTER made the following acknowledgment: ‘ I confess my style is *naturally keen* ‡.’ I am a little suspicious also, that Dr. OWEN had some cause for speaking of his writings as follows. ‘ I verily believe, that if a man who had nothing else to do, should gather into one heap all the expressions which in his late books, Confessions, and Apologies, have a *lovely* aspect towards himself, as to ability, diligence, sincerity, on the one hand; with all those which are full of *reproach* and *contempt* towards others, on the other; the view of them, could not but a little startle a man of so great modesty, and of such eminency in the mortification of pride, as Mr. BAXTER is §.’—Hence we learn, that Baptists are not the only persons who have felt the weight of Mr. BAXTER’s hand; so that if a recol-

\* Plain Scripture Proof, p. 134—137.

† Ut supra, p. 88.

‡ Ibid. p. 246.

§ Of the Death of Christ, p. 5. subjoined to his *Mythology of the Gospel vindicated*.

section of others having suffered under the keen resentment can afford relief, the poor Baptists may take some comfort: and it is an old saying,

*Solamen miseris socios habuisse doloris.*

Besides, there is a precept of HORACE which occurs to remembrance, and is of use in the present exigence, *Amara lento temperet risu*, is the advice to which I refer; and under the influence of this direction we are led to say: Poor man! He seems to be afflicted with a violent hydrophobia! for he cannot think of any person being immersed in cold water, but he starts, he is convulsed, he is ready to die with fear. Immersion, you must know, is like Pandora's box, and pregnant with a great part of those diseases which MILTON's angel presented to the view of our first father. A compassionate regard therefore to the lives of his fellow creatures, compels Mr. BAXTER to solicit the aid of magistrates against this destructive plunging, and to cry out in the spirit of an exclamation once heard in the Jewish temple; 'Ye men of Israel, help! or Baptist ministers will depopulate your country. Know you not, that these plunging teachers are shrewdly suspected of being pensioned by avaricious landlords, to destroy the lives of your liege subjects? Exert your power: apprehend the delinquents: appoint an *Auto da Fe*; let the venal dip-pers be baptized in blood, and thus put a salutary stop to their pestiferous practice.'—What a pity it is, that the celebrated *History of Cold Bathing*, by Sir JOHN FLOYER, was not published half a century sooner! It might perhaps have preserved this good man from a multitude of painful paroxysms, occasioned by the thought of immersion in cold water.—Were I seriously to put a query on these assertions of Mr. BAXTER, it should be, with a little variation, in the

the most *decent* *English* *language* *can* *be* *done* *unto* *thee*, *thou* *va* *con* *pen*! Were the temper which dictated the preceding caricature to receive its just reproof, it might be in the language of Michael; *The Lord rebuke thee!*

Before I dismiss this extraordinary language of Mr. BAXTER it is proper to be observed, that the charge of shocking indecency, which he lays with such confidence against the Baptists of those times, was not suffered by them to pass without animadversion. No, he was challenged to make it good: it was denied, it was confuted by them. With a view to which Dr. WALL says; ‘The English Antipædobaptists need not have made *so great an outcry* against Mr. BAXTER for his saying that they baptized *naked*: for if they had, it had been no more than the primitive Christians did\*.’ But surely they had reason to complain of *misrepresentation*; such misrepresentation as tended to bring the greatest *odium* upon their sentiment and practice. Besides, however ancient the practice charged upon them was, its antiquity could not have justified their conduct: except it had been derived from divine command, or apostolic example; neither of which appears.—Whether Mr. HENRY, in the passage already remarked, proceeds on the authority of Mr. BAXTER, in regard to that outrage on decency with which we are charged, or what induced him to record such things, is not for me to determine: but I cannot forbear wondering that Mr. ROBINS should *publish* the obnoxious sentence; as it appears from his own declaration†, that he has *very much abridged* the Treatise. He hopes, indeed, that very few expressions will be found in the work, that are

\* *Hist. Inf. Bap.* Part II. Chap. ix. § 3.

† *Advertisement,*



'offensive' to persons and candid readers of any denomination \*; but whether the expressions to which I advert be not *justly offensive*; whether the offence given to many of his Brethren who, I trust, have some degree of candour and seriousness, be not owing to *his* labours, as the Editor; and whether both candour and seriousness do not oblige him to imitate the following confession of Mr. BAXTER, I leave to my Reader's judgment. 'Upon the review of my arguments, upon the controversy about Infant baptism, says the famous Nonconformist; I find that I have used too many provoking words, for which I am heartily sorry, and desire pardon of God and him †,' i. e. of Mr. TOMBES.

Now as it appears by the concessions, declarations, and reasonings of so many learned Pædobaptists themselves, that the natural and proper idea of the term baptism, the design of the institution, and the example of the Apostles, are all in favour of immersion, and all agree with our practice; we do not, we cannot want any thing more to justify our conduct, either before God or man. This must be the case, except the united testimony of such a cloud of witnesses, and the reasons of it, can be confronted with superior evidence. We have however a few more testimonies and concessions to review, relating to this branch of the subject.

\* *Ut supra*, p. 8.  
 p. 55.

† In Mr. CROSBY'S *Hist. Bap.* Vol. III.

## CHAPTER V.

*The present Practice of the Greek and Oriental Churches,  
in regard to the Mode of Administration.*

**HASSELQUIST:** "The Greeks christen their children immediately after their birth, or within a few days at least, dipping them in warm water; and in this respect they are much wiser than their brethren the Russians, who dip them into rivers in the coldest winter." *Travels*, p. 394.

2. **ANONYMOUS:** "The Muscovite priests—plunge the child three times over head and ears in water." *Encyclopæd. Britan.* Vol. IX. p. 6910.

3. **VENEMA:** "In pronouncing the baptismal form of words, the Greeks use the third person, saying, *Let the servant of Christ be baptized, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit;* and immerse the whole man in water." *Hist. Eccles.* Tom. VI. p. 660.

4. **DEYLINGIUS:** "The Greeks retain the rite of immersion to this day; as JEREMIAH the Patriarch of Constantinople declares." *De Prudent. Pastoral.* Pars III. C. iii. § 26.

5. **MR. MILLAR:** "In baptism they [the Muscovites] dip their children in cold water." *Propagation of Christ.* Vol. II. Chap. vi. p. 115.

6. **BUDDEUS:** "That the Greeks defend immersion is manifest, and has been frequently observed by learned men: which LUDOLPHUS informs us is the practice of the Ethiopians." *Theolog. Dogmat.* L. V. C. i. § 5.

7. WITSIUS: "That immersion may be practised in cold countries, without any great danger of health and life, the Muscovites prove by their own example; who entirely immerse their infants three times in water, not believing that baptism can be otherwise rightly administered. Nor do they ever use warm water, except for those that are weak or sickly." *OEcon. Fœd. L. IV. C. xvi. § 13.*

8. Sir PAUL RICAUT: "The modern Greek church defines baptism to be, *A cleansing, or taking away of original sin, by thrice dipping or plunging into the water: the priest saying at every dipping, In the name of the Father, Amen; and of the Son, Amen; and of the Holy-Ghost, Amen.* This thrice dipping or plunging into the water, this church holds to be as necessary to the form of baptism, as water to the matter." *Present State of the Greek Church, p. 163.*

9. Dr. J. G. KING: "The Greek church uniformly practises the trine immersion, undoubtedly the most primitive manner." *Rules and Cerem. of the Greek Church in Russia, p. 192.*

10. Dr. WALL: "All the Christians in Asia, all in Africa, and about one third part of Europe, are of the last sort, [i. e. practise immersion;] in which third part of Europe, are comprehended the Christians of Græcia, Thracia, Servia, Bulgaria, Rascia, Walachia, Moldavia, Russia, Nigra, and so on; and even the Mulcovites, who, if coldness of the country will excuse, might plead for a dispensation with the most reason of any." *Hist. of Inf. Bap. Part II. Chap. ix. p. 477.*

## R E F L E C T I O N S.

REFLECT. I. As it appears from the preceding Chapter that immersion was the general and almost universal

universal practice for a long course of ages; and, as various of those learned authors assert, for THIRTEEN CENTURIES; so it is manifest from these quotations, that it has been uninterruptedly continued as the general mode of proceeding, in all the Greek and Oriental churches. Now these churches, as Dr. WALL informs us, comprehend 'very near one half the Christians in the world\*.' Nay, Dr. KING tells us, that they have 'a greater extent than the Latin, with 'all the branches which are sprung from it†.' Consequently, though we are far from considering the numbers that adopt a sentiment or a practice as the criterion of truth, or of right; yet we may confidently assert, that our practice of immersion, as essential to the ordinance, is neither that novel, nor yet that singular thing, which many of our opponents are very desirous of making their neighbours believe it to be. Nor can I forbear to wonder at their inadvertency, when they act in this manner: and as to ministers of the English Establishment, it requires an uncommon degree of ignorance, of prejudice, of prevarication, or of assurance, for any of *them* to treat immersion as a novel, an indecent, or an unjustifiable practice: because the Rubric of their Liturgy, that Rubric which they have solemnly professed to believe and approve, even that very Rubric which they have engaged to treat as the *law* of their proceedings, in the administration of baptism, as well as in other cases, expressly requires it; except the sponsors inform the priest, that the child cannot well bear to be dipped. To which the Catechism of the same Establishment plainly adverts, when it instructs the catechumen to say; 'Water, *wherein* the person is bap-

\* See Vol. II Chap. v. No. 7. of this work, *Cerem. of the Greek Church*, p. 3.

† *Rites and*  
'tized.'

'tized.' For the idea of pouring, or of sprinkling, cannot be applied here, without rendering the language absurd. Upon the Review of the Common Prayer book at the Restauration, says Dr. WALL, the Church of England did not think fit (however prevalent the custom of sprinkling was) to forego their maxim; *That it is most fitting to dip children that are well able to bear it.* But they leave it wholly to the judgment of the godfathers and those that bring the child, whether the child may well endure dipping, or not—The difference is only this: By the Rubric, as it stood before, the priest was to dip unless there were an averment or allegation of weakness: Now he is not to dip, unless there be an averment or certifying of strength sufficient to endure it\*.—Agreeable to this, is the former Confession of Helvetia: *Baptism, according to the institution of the Lord, is the font of regeneration;—in which holy font we do therefore dip our infants†.* The Confession of Saxony, thus: *Baptism is an entire action: to wit, a dipping, and the pronouncing of those words, I baptize thee in the name, and so on†.*

REFLECT. II. In respect of the *true* immersion, practised by the Greek Church and the Eastern Christians, though it be undoubtedly of great antiquity; and though it appear to have originated in a strong but misapplied regard to that capital article of the Christian creed, the doctrine of the Holy Trinity; yet as there is no intimation in the New Testament, that it was either enjoined by Christ, or practised by his Apostles, we cannot agree with Dr. KING, when he calls it, 'the most primitive manner.' See No. 9.

\* *Hist Inf Bap.* Part II. Chap. ix. p. 473.  
*of Confessions*, p. 397, 404.

† *Harmony*

An Apostle indeed mentions the *trine* of baptisms; but, as a Pædobaptist author observes, 'That the *trine* immersion was the occasion of the expression, there is no ground to believe, because so much later than that time\*.' It was however practised even here, in the time of EDWARD the Sixth; for according to his first Common Prayer book, 'the minister is to dip the child in the water *thrice*: first dipping the right side; secondly, the left, the third time, dipping the face towards the font†.'

Mr. HENRY, when pleading the cause of aspersion, says: 'I believe that immersion, yea *trine* immersion, or plunging the person baptized three times, was commonly used in very early ages; and that, *as far as* POPERY prevailed, a great deal of stress was laid upon it‡' Would this ingenious author, then, persuade us that immersion, whether once, or thrice, originated in Popery, and that it was peculiar to such professors of Christianity as acknowledged the Papal authority? If so, he labours to possess his readers of a gross mistake. For as to immersion, it appears I think with sufficient evidence, by quotations already produced from the most eminent Pædobaptists, that it has the sanction of divine authority in the apostolic practice. And as to the *trine* immersion, it is manifest from TERTULLIAN that it was commonly used, long before the supremacy of the bishop of Rome was either claimed by himself, or acknowledged by others; yet the term *Popery* signifies a system of religious principles and practices, in which an acknowledgment of that supremacy makes a distinguishing and capital figure. 'By *Popery*,' says that excellent polemical author, STAF-

\* *Cure of Desires*, Vol. I Chap. iv p. 131, 132. † *Encyclopædia*  
B. Art. BAPTISM. ‡ *Tr. tise on Bap* p. 137

‘**REMARKS**, we understand that religion which considers the Pope as the visible and principal head of the church;—whence also it has its name \*.’ Besides, it appears that the Greek and Oriental churches, which include one half the Christian world, have always practised immersion; and that, for a long course of ages, the trine immersion has been their general custom: yet they never acknowledged the Papal power; nor, so far as I have observed, was their profession of Christianity ever called *Popery*. How untair then is the insinuation contained in these words; ‘As far as *Popery* prevailed!’ As if the Papists in former times had been the only persons that pleaded for the baptismal plunging; and as if our practice had been derived from them! That an author of Mr. HENRY’s learning, reading, and character should insinuate such things, is amazing! We are indeed so far from having derived immersion from Popery, that quite the reverse is a fact: for learned Pædobaptists themselves assure us, that pouring and sprinkling, as a common practice, have an exclusive claim to the honour of such an original. See CHAP. VII. No. 21, 23. and REFLECT. V.

\* *Institut. Theolog. Polem.* Cap. XIV. § 1.

## CHAPTER VI.

*The Design of Baptism more fully expressed by Immersion, than by Pouring or Sprinkling.*

**W**ITSIUS: "It must not be dissembled, that there is in immersion a greater fruitfulness of signification, and a more perfect correspondence between the sign and the thing signified; as we shall show, when we come to that part of our subject." *Œcon. Fœd.* L. IV. C. xvi. § 13.

2. **ALSFREDIUS**: "The rite of immersion, which is intimated by the very word baptism, certainly bears a greater analogy to the thing signified." *Lexicon Theologicum*, Cap. xii. p. 223.

3. **Mr. JOHN ROGERS**: "I dare not deny my judgment to teach thus far for dipping, above the other forms of sprinkling or pouring, that were it as orderly in our Church, and used, and no offence to weak souls, I would sooner be induced to dip one that was never before baptized, than to sprinkle one: for to me it would be more significant, and full, and pregnant with former practices\*." In **Mr. CROSBY'S** *Hist. Bap.* Vol. III. Pref. p. 53.

\* To the testimonies already produced (p. 102, 103) respecting the baptism of the Holy Spirit, I will here add the following, from two learned members of the Church of England **Mr. LEIGH**: 'Baptized, that is, drown you all over, dip you into the ocean of his grace, opposite to the sprinkling which was in the law.' *Annotat.* on Matt. iii. 11. **Bp. HOPKINS**: 'Those that are baptized with the Spirit, are as it were plunged into that heavenly flame, whose searching energy devours all their dross, tin, and base alloy.' *Works*, p. 519. Note. These testimonies had not occurred to observation soon enough to be inserted in their proper place.



4. HEIDEGGERUS: "Though the rite of immersion be more ancient, and on account of its more fully representing a death and burial, more expressive, Rom. vi. 4; yet it appears from what has been said, that aspersion makes no alteration in the essence and mystery of baptism." *Corpus Theolog.* Loc. XXV. § 35.

5. ESTIUS: "Though the ceremony of immersion was anciently more common, as appears from the unanimous language of the Fathers, as often as they speak about baptism; and in a more expressive manner represents the death, burial, and resurrection of our Lord, and of us;—whence St. THOMAS affirms, that the rite of dipping is more commendable; yet there have been many reasons, for which it was sometimes convenient to alter immersion into some other kindred ceremony. Hence therefore the ceremony of *pouring*, as a medium between dipping and sprinkling, was much used; which custom, BONAVENTURE says, was in his time much observed in the French churches and some others; though he confesses that the ceremony of immersion was the more common, the more fit, and the more safe, as S. THOMAS teaches." 'Apud KNATCHBUL. *Animadversf. in Lib. Nov. Test.* p. 181.

6. Dr. CLARKE: "In the primitive times, the manner of baptizing was by immersion, or dipping the whole body into the water. And this manner of doing it was a very significant emblem of the dying and rising again referred to by St. Paul," Rom. vi. 4. *Exposf. of Church Catechism*, p. 294.

7. Mr. W. PERKINS: "A question may be made, whether washing of the body in baptism must be by dipping, or by sprinkling? Answer: In hot countries, and in the baptism of men of years, dipping was used,  
and

~~and that by the Apostles; and to this Paul alludes,~~  
 and that by the Apostles; and to this Paul alludes,  
 Rom. vi. 3: and dipping doth more fully represent our  
 spiritual washing, than sprinkling." *Works*, Vol. II.  
 p. 256.

8. PICTETUS: "It was usual in ancient times for  
 the whole body to be immersed in water—and it must  
 be confessed that such a rite most happily represented  
 that grace by which our sins are as it were drowned,  
 and we raised again from the abyss of sin." *Theolog.*  
*Christ.* L. XIV. C. iv. § 17.

9. MASTRICHT: "Immersion—was used by the  
 Apostles and primitive churches, because it is not only  
 more agreeable in the warm Eastern countries, but al-  
 so more significant, Rom. vi. 3, 4, 5." *Theologia*, L.  
 VII. C. iv. § 9.

10. H. ALTINGIUS: After briefly stating the ar-  
 guments for plunging, and for sprinkling, he adds;  
 "We confess, first, that immersion was the prior rite;  
 because it was first used by John the Baptist and the  
 Apostles. Secondly, it is also more expressive, on ac-  
 count of the distinct acts, Rom. vi." *Theolog. Problem.*  
*Nov. Loc.* XIV. Prob. xi. p. 657.

11. M. MORUS: "Baptism was formerly cele-  
 brated by plunging the whole body in water, and not  
 by casting a few drops of water on the forehead; that  
 representing death and the resurrection much better  
 than this." In Mr. STENNETT's *Answer to Mr. RUS-*  
*SEN*, p. 149.

12. VOSSIUS: "All the particulars that we have  
 mentioned, concerning the signification of baptism,  
 will appear with sufficient perspicuity in the rite of  
 immersion: but not equally so if mere sprinkling be  
 used. It should not be supposed however that all ana-  
 logy is destroyed by it." *Disputat. de Bap.* Disp. III.  
 § 10.

12. **DAILEY**, speaking of a twofold effect of baptism, says: "In the primitive church, this double effect of baptism was more clearly represented in the external action of the sacrament [by immersion] than it is at this day." *Serm. on Epist. to Coloss. on Chap. ii.* 12, p. 245.

14. **BUDDEUS**: "Though immersion is to be preferred, yet baptism administered by sprinkling, or pouring, is not therefore to be accounted unlawful—Immersion, which was used in former times, as we have before declared, was a symbol and an image of the death and burial of Christ: by which we are taught, that the remains of sin, which are called *the old man*, should also be put to death; that is, as Paul elsewhere speaks, our *flesh, with its affections and lusts*, should be *crucified*. For in that way we as it were die and are buried with Christ: which Paul expressly shows, Rom. vi. 4. An emersion out of the water follows, (Matt. iii. 16.) which exhibits a most beautiful image of the resurrection of Christ; and at the same time it affords matter of instruction concerning that spiritual resurrection, which is effected by daily renovation. Rom. vi. 4. Now though all these things are a little more clearly exhibited by immersion, than by pouring or sprinkling; yet, nevertheless, in the latter some likeness of them is beheld: seeing, even by pouring, especially if it be performed by a remarkably large quantity of water, the infant is in a manner covered and buried in water; like as it emerges thence, when the water poured upon it is all run off." *Theolog. Dogmat. L. V. C. i. § 5, 8.*

15. **Dr. CAVE**: "The party to be baptized was wholly immersed, or put under water;—whereby they did more notably and significantly express the three great ends

Order, Manner, and Efficacy of Baptism. 277  
ends and efficacy of baptism." *Primitive Christianity*,  
Part I. Chap. x. p. 203.

16. Dr. WALL: "I had the disadvantage [in defending the common practice] to plead for a way of baptism, of which the best I could say was, That it is sufficient for the essence of baptism; but could not deny the other (except in the case of danger of health) to be the fittest—The immersion of the person, whether infant or adult, in the posture of one that is buried and raised up again, is much more solemn, and expresses the design of the sacrament and the mystery of the spiritual washing much better, than pouring a small quantity of water on the face. And that pouring of water, is much better than sprinkling, or dropping a drop of water on it. If it be done in the church, in, or at the font, and the congregation do join in the prayers there used; it is much more solemn than in a bed-chamber, out of a basin, or pipkin, a tea-cup, or a punch-bowl; and a bed-chamber is perhaps not quite so scandalous as a kitchen or stable, to which things look as if they would bring it at last—We have reason to give God thanks, that the present orders and rubrics of our church are all calculated for the reforming of these abuses, and preserving the dignity of this holy sacrament; and that there wants nothing but the due execution of them, and our conscientious performing of that which we solemnly promised before God and the bishop, when we had the charge of souls committed to us, that *we would conform to the Liturgy of the church of England, as it is now by law established*.—I know that some midwives and nurses do, on the christening day, (which they think is observed, not so much for the sacrament itself, as for their showing their pride, art, and finery) dress the child's head so, that the face of it being hid deep under the lace and trimming

trimming which stands up so high on each side, the minister cannot come at the face to pour water on it, so as that it may run off again; but what water he pours, will run in among the head-cloths, which really is likely to do the child more hurt than dipping would have done." *Defence of Hist. Inf. Bap.* p. 404—408.

## R E F L E C T I O N S.

**REFLECT. I.** From these quotations we learn, That immersion, compared with pouring or sprinkling, has the honour of priority, in respect of time. No. 4, 10, 14.—That it is more significant. No. 1—16.—That it is more safe, or certain of being right. No. 5.—And that one of these learned authors, who had well studied the subject, felt by painful experience the disadvantage under which a Pædobaptist labours, and the arduous task he has to perform, when he undertakes to defend any mode of administration short of dipping; because the best he can say of it is, that the essence of baptism is not wanting. No. 16. See Chap. III. Reflect. IV.

**REFLECT. II.** I can hardly forbear supposing that the attentive Reader anticipates my reflections here, and is ready to exclaim: What, practise a mode of administering baptism, that is rejected by one half the world; while you cannot but acknowledge, that antiquity, significance, and safety of being right, may be all fairly pleaded against it! As if they professedly imitated the Roman Catholics, in regard to the invocation of saints! For CHEMNITIUS tells us, "Many among the Papists acknowledge, that it is better, more agreeable to rule, more certain, and more safe, to invoke God himself in the name of Christ, than  
to."

‘to address prayer to saints.’ Strange, that there should be such charms in a religious custom, which is a confessed variation from the examples of Apostles, of Martyrs, of Christians almost universally for the long time of thirteen hundred years, and of so great a part of those who bear the character of Christians at this day! Strange, indeed, that any who are the friends of Christ, should confessedly impoverish the significance of a sacred rite; and then labour, and strive; and toil, in order to prove that they have not annihilated the essence of it! Very singular conduct this, relating to an ordinance of God, a branch of divine worship, and a mean of human happiness! But is it commendable, is it justifiable, is it rational, that the professed followers of Jesus Christ should study to find out the exact boundaries of *essence*, in a positive institution; that they may be able to determine with precision, how far they may vary from the natural import of our Lord’s command, his own example, and the practice of his Ambassadors, without intrenching on what is essential to the appointment? Let candour, let common sense determine. Dr. MAYO has well observed, That ‘all great errors and evils in the Christian church had small beginnings; we are therefore not to shake light of those things in religion, which yet may not be of the essence thereof.’

How much is the conduct of these authors, like that of the Roman Catholics in another case! The latter, we know, administer the Lord’s supper to the people in one kind; even while they cannot but acknowledge that Christ appointed the use of wine, as well as of bread; that the Apostles administered both kinds; that the church for many centuries received the sacred

\* Exam. Concil. Trident. p. 613. † Apology and Shield, p. 165.

280
[CHAP. VI]  
 supper in both kinds; and that the representation of  
 our Lord's death is more complete, by the adminis-  
 tration of both kinds: yet, after all these concessions,  
 pretend that they do not intrench on the *essence* of  
 the ordinance, by administering the bread only! But,  
 strange as their procedure is, it must be with an ill  
 grace that any of the writers here produced object  
 against that mutilation of the holy supper.—For though  
 they do not explicitly avow, they seem entirely to ap-  
 prove the reasoning of BELLARMINE, when he speaks  
 in the following manner: ‘ Though more grace and  
 ‘ advantage be received by partaking of both kinds,  
 ‘ than only of one; it is not therefore necessary that  
 ‘ all should communicate of both species: because of  
 ‘ two evils, the less ought always to be chosen. Now  
 ‘ it is a less evil that some persons should want a be-  
 ‘ nefit which is not necessary, than that the sacrament  
 ‘ should be exposed to the evident danger of being  
 ‘ irreverently used \*.’ It is *danger* of irreverence,  
 we see, that is pleaded by Papists for their mutilation  
 of the holy supper: it is also *danger* of indecency, or  
 of health, which urges Pædobaptists to lay aside im-  
 mersion, as the Reader may learn from the following  
 Chapter. How lamentable to reflect, that, respecting  
 the administration of positive appointments, there  
 should be such a coalition between the subjects of the  
 triple crown, and professed Protestants!

Besides, the best evidence yet produced, that pour-  
 ing or sprinkling contains the *essence* of baptism, has  
 always been treated by a very large part of the Chris-  
 tian world, as extremely doubtful. In proof of this  
 assertion, I appeal to the authorities produced, CHAP.  
 IV. and V. and to those which follow in the next.—

\* Apud CHAMIERUM, *Parænet.* Tom. IV. L. IX. C. x. § 6.

Being taught, therefore, by so many respectable Pædobaptists, that the radical idea of the term baptism, the chief design of the ordinance, the Apostolic example, the present practice of one half the Christian world, and the emphasis of signification, are all in favour of immersion; we must stand acquitted of blame, and our conduct in regard to dipping deserve imitation. It cannot indeed be otherwise, except it should hereafter appear, that substantial reasons may be assigned for altering the practice of immersion to that of pouring, or of sprinkling: and substantial they must be to answer so important an end, in the face of all these concessions and all this evidence. It would be the height of precipitancy, and little short of religious madness to desert, without the most cogent reasons, a practice thus recommended, for one that appears in such embarrassment. What those reasons are, that have been thought sufficient by many of the most learned Pædobaptists; what their force, and what regard they deserve, must be considered in the following Chapter.



## CHAPTER VII.

### *The Reasons, Rise, and Prevalence of Pouring, or Sprinkling, instead of Immersion.*

**DEYLINGIUS:** "So long as the Apostles lived, as many believe, immersion only was used\*: to which afterward, perhaps, they added a kind of affusion, such as the Greeks practise at this day, after having performed the trine immersion. At length, after the Apostles were dead, the baptism of Clinics was known; when disease, or extreme necessity in any other respect, forbidding immersion, sprinkling and pouring began to be introduced; which in a course of time were retained, plunging being neglected. For in following times, when adult persons were very seldom baptized, infants were initiated into the Christian church by pouring and by sprinkling." *Observat. Sac. Pars III. Observ. xxvi. § 2.*

2. **SALMASIUS:** "The Clinics only, because they were confined to their beds, were baptized in a manner of which they were capable: not in the entire laver, as those who plunge the head under water; but the *whole body* had water poured upon it. As **CYPR. IV. Epist. vii.** Thus **NOVATUS**, when sick, received baptism; being (περιχυθεὶς) *besprinkled*, not (βαπτισθεὶς) *baptized*. **EUSEB. VI. Hist. Cap. xliii.**" Apud **WITSIUM, OEcon. Fœd. L. IV. C. xvi. § 13.**

\* Of this opinion is **Mr. PICART**, who says; 'Baptism by ablution, or aspersion, was not known in the first century of the church, when immersion was only used; and 'tis said it continued so till **St. GREGORY's** time.' *Relig. Cerem. Vol. II. p. 82.*

3. **Mr.**

~~CHAP. VII. Of the manner of baptizing.~~

3. Mr. FORMEY: "Putting off their clothes, they were dipped three times in water;—but when they administered baptism to the Cliniques, i. e. to those who were confined to their beds from illness, they made use only of simple sprinkling." *Abridg. Eccles. Hist.* Vol. I. p. 33.

4. TURRETTINUS: "Immersion was used in former times and in warm climates, as we are taught by the practice of John the Baptist, Matt. iii. 6, 16; of Christ's Apostles, Joh. iii. 22. and iv. 1, 2; and of Philip, Acts viii. 38. But now, especially in cold countries, when the church began to extend itself towards the North, plunging (*κατακοντισμος*) was changed into sprinkling, and asperision only is used." *Institut.* Loc. XIX. Quæst. xi. § 11.

5. Mr. W. PERKINS: "The ancient custom of baptizing was to dip, and as it were to dive all the body of the baptized in the water, as may appear in Paul, Rom. vi. and the Councils of Laodicea and Neocaesarea; but now, especially in cold countries, the church useth only to sprinkle the baptized, by reason of children's weakness: for very few of ripe years are now-a-days baptized. We need not much to marvel at this alteration, seeing charity and necessity may dispense with ceremonies, and mitigate in equity the sharpness of them." *Works*, Vol. I. p. 74. Edit. 1608.

6. Dr. MANTON: "You will say, If the rite [of immersion] hath this signification, [Christ's death for sin, and our death to sin] why is it not retained? I answer, Christianity lieth not in ceremonies: the principal thing in baptism is the washing away of sin, Acts xxii. 16; that may be done by pouring on of water, as well as dipping." *Serm. on Rom. vi. 4.*

7. WALÆUS: "In warm countries, the ancients practised an immersion of the whole body;—but in colder

**8. CALDER: B. A. and Synod.** (Chap. VII.)  
colder climates they generally used aspersion: because  
a ceremony that is free, ought always to give way to  
charity." *Enchiridium*, de Bap. p. 425.

**8. PAMELIUS:** "Whereas the sick, by reason of  
their illness, could not be immersed or plunged (which,  
properly speaking, is to be baptized;) they had the salu-  
tary water poured upon them, or were sprinkled with it.  
For the same reason, I think, the custom of sprinkling  
now used, first began to be observed by the Western  
church; namely, on account of the tenderness of in-  
fants, seeing the baptism of adults was now very sel-  
dom practised." Apud FORBESIUM, *Instruct. Hist.*  
*Theolog.* L. X. C. v. § 57.

**9. HOORNBEEKIUS:** "In the Eastern churches  
baptism was more anciently administered by immersing  
the body in water. Afterward, first in the Western  
churches, on account of the coldness of the countries,  
bathing being less in use than in the East, and the ten-  
derage of those that were baptized, dipping or sprink-  
ling was admitted." *Miscell. Sac.* L. I. C. xvii. Sect.  
iv. § 1.

**10. GROTIUS:** "The custom of pouring or sprink-  
ling seems to have prevailed in favour of those that  
were dangerously ill, and were desirous of giving up  
themselves to Christ; whom others called *Climics*. See  
the Epistle of CYPRIAN to MAGNUS." Apud POLI  
*Synopsin*, ad Matt. iii. 6.

**11. H. ALTINGIUS:** "The baptismal washing,  
in warm countries and ancient times, was performed  
by immersion;—but now, especially in cold countries,  
it is performed by only sprinkling—The cause of the  
alteration is, that immersion, which was used in the  
warm Eastern and Southern countries, is less conveni-  
ent in the cold Western and Northern climates; where  
there is danger of health from immersion, especially  
of

CHAP. VII. *Of Sprinkling instead of Immersion.* 331  
 of infants. And therefore that rule is here in force: *I will have mercy and not sacrifice.*" *Loci Commun.* I. Loc. xii. p. 198, 199. *Theolog. Problem.* Nov. Loc. XIV. Prob. xi. p. 657.

12. E. SPANHEMIUS: "In these Northern and colder countries, out of regard to the tender age of infants, we use aspersion in the place of immersion; which, of old, was usually practised, either in open rivers, or in private baptisteries, and vessels filled with water." *Disputat. Syntag. Disp. de Bap.* § 16.

13. QUENSTEDIUS: "When occasion was but seldom given of baptizing adults, and very frequently of baptizing infants, the church consulted their weakness; whence by little and little aspersion was introduced, till at length, immersion being laid aside, it prevailed. Of which change there was a threefold reason; the *tenderness* of infants—*shame*, especially in regard to female Catechumens—and because, even in the very act of baptizing, *natura cursum suum tenet*; sicut contigit magnis Impm. in Oriente CONSTANTINO Copronymo cognominato, et in Occidente WENCESLAO; qui cum immergerentur, *aquam baptismalem macularunt* \*." *Antiq. Bib. C.* iv. Sect. II. Num. I. § 4. p. 319.

14. RIISSENIUS: "Though in warm countries immersion was practised in former times, yet now, especially in colder climates, aspersion may be rightly used." *Summa Theolog.* Loc. XVII. § 31.

\* Had any Baptist assigned such a reason for immersion being laid aside, he would, I suspect, have been charged with *gross indelicacy*, and loaded with censure, by many of our opposers, even though they could not have disproved the fact. This, however, proceeds from an eminent Lutheran who was no friend to the Baptists. See *Hist. of Popery*, Vol. I. p. 141.

15. KECKER-

tism properly signifies immersion, and though also in the ancient church, through the Eastern countries, when baptism was administered, it was, not by sprinkling; but by immersion; yet in the colder parts of Christendom aspersion is used instead of immersion, on account of infants: because charity and necessity may dispense with ceremonies, and temper them with gentleness, so far as may be done without injuring the analogy." *System. Theolog.* L. III. C. viii.

16. PISCATOR: "Whether the whole body be dipped, and that thrice, or once; or whether water be only poured or sprinkled on the party; this ought to be free to the churches, according to the difference of countries." *Aphorismi Doct. Christ.* Loc. XXIV. Aph. 9.

17. Mr. RICH. BAXTER: "We grant that baptism then [in the primitive times] was by washing the whole body; and did not the difference of our cold country, as to that hot one, teach us to remember, *I will have mercy and not sacrifice*, it should be so here." *Paraphrase on the New Test.* at Matt. iii. 6.

18. Bp. BURNET: "The danger of dipping in cold climates, may be a very good reason for changing the form of baptism to sprinkling." *Exposition of XXXIX Articles*, p. 436.

19. VENEMA: "Sprinkling was used in the last moments of life, on such as were called Clinics;—also where there was not a sufficient quantity of water." *Hist. Eccles.* Tom. IV. Secul. iv. § 110.

20. Dr. TOWERSON: "The first mention we find of aspersion in the baptism of the elder sort, was in the case of the *Clinici*, or men who received baptism upon their sick beds; and that baptism is represented by

S. CYPRIAN

~~Cal. viii. 30. speaking of baptism by immersion.~~

**S. CYPRIAN** is likewise upon the account of the necessity that compelled it, and the presumption that was of God's gracious acceptance thereof because of it. By which means the lawfulness of any other baptism than by an immersion, will be found to lie in the necessity there may sometimes be of another manner of administration of it." *Of the Sacram. of Bap.* Part III. p. 59, 60.

21. **SIR JOHN FLOYER**: "The Church of Rome hath drawn short compendiums of both sacraments. In the Eucharist, they use only the wafer,—and instead of immersion they introduced asperision—I have now given what testimony I could find in our English authors, to prove the practice of immersion from the time the Britons and Saxons were baptized, till king **JAMES's** days; when the people grew peevish with all ancient ceremonies, and through the love of novelty, and the niceness of parents, and the pretence of modesty, they laid aside immersion; which never was abrogated by any Canon, but is still recommended by the present Rubric of our Church, which orders the child to be dip't discreetly and warily." *Hist. of Cold Bathing*, p. 15, 61.

22. **DR. R. WETHAM**: "The word baptism signifies a washing, particularly when it is done by immersion, or by dipping, or plunging a thing under water, which was formerly the ordinary way of administering the sacrament of baptism. But the Church, which cannot change the least article of the Christian faith, is not so tied up in matters of discipline and ceremonies. Not only the Catholic Church, but also the pretended Reformed churches, have altered this primitive custom in giving the sacrament of baptism, and now allow of baptism by pouring or sprinkling water on the person baptized. Nay, many  
of

... ministers do it now, some by slipping a wet finger and thumb over a child's head, or by shaking a wet finger or two over the child, which it is hard enough to call a baptizing in any sense. "Annotations on the New Test. at Matt. iii. 6.

83. Dr. WALD: "In the case of sickness, weakness, haste, want of quantity of water, or such like extraordinary occasions, baptism by affusion of water on the face, was by the ancients counted sufficient baptism. I shall out of the many proofs of it produce two or three of the *most ancient*. Anno Dom. two hundred and fifty one, NOVATIAN was by one party of the clergy and people of Rome chosen bishop of that church, in a schismatical way, and in opposition to CORNELIUS, who had been before chosen by the major part, and was already ordained. CORNELIUS does in a letter to FABIVS, bishop of Antioch, vindicate his right: and shows that NOVATIAN came not canonically to his orders of priesthood, much less was he capable of being chosen bishop; for that *all the clergy and a great many of the laity, were against his being ordained presbyter, because it was not lawful (they said) for any one that had been baptized in his bed in time of sickness, [τον εν κλινη δια νοσον περιχυθεντα] as he had been, to be admitted to any office of the clergy*—France seems to have been the first country in the world, where baptism by affusion was used ordinarily to persons in health, and in the public way of administering it—It being allowed to weak children [in the reign of Queen ELIZABETH]—to be baptized by aspersion; many fond ladies and gentlewomen first, and then by degrees the common people, would obtain the favour of the priest to have their children pass for weak children, too tender to endure dipping in the water. Especially, as Mr. WALKER observes,

**SECT. VII. Of Sprinkling, or of dipping.**

*if some instance really were, or were but fancied, framed, of some child's taking hurt by it*—CALVIN had not only given his dictate in his Institutions, that the difference is of no moment, whether he that is baptized be dipt all over, and if so, whether thrice or once; or whether he be only wetted by the water poured on him. but he had also drawn up for the use of his church at Geneva, and afterwards published to the world, *A Form of administering the Sacraments*; where, when he comes to order the act of baptizing, he words it thus, *Then the minister of baptism POURS water on the infant*, saying, *I baptize thee*, and so on. There had been—some synods in some diocesses of France, that had spoken of affusion without mentioning immersion at all, that being the common practice, but for an Office or Liturgy of any church, this is, I believe, the first in the world that prescribes aspersion absolutely—And for sprinkling properly called, it seems it was, at sixteen hundred and forty five, just then beginning, and used by very few. It must have began in the disorderly times after forty one—But then came *The Directory*,—and says, *Baptism is to be administered, not in private places, or privately; but in the place of public worship, and in the face of the congregation*, and so on. *And not in the places where fonts, in the time of Popery, were unfitly and superstitiously placed*. So—they reformed the font into a basin. This learned Assembly could not remember, that fonts to baptize in, had been always used by the primitive Christians, long before the beginning of Popery, and ever since churches were built: but that sprinkling, for the common use of baptizing, was really introduced (in France first, and then in other Popish countries) in times of Popery. And that accordingly, ALL THOSE COUNTRIES IN WHICH



THE USURPED POWER OF THE POPE IS, OR HAS FORMERLY BEEN OWNED, HAVE LEFT OFF DIPPING OF CHILDREN IN THE FONT: BUT THAT ALL OTHER COUNTRIES IN THE WORLD, WHICH HAD NEVER REGARDED HIS AUTHORITY, DO STILL USE IT; AND THAT BASINS, EXCEPT IN CASE OF NECESSITY, WERE NEVER USED BY PAPISTS, OR ANY OTHER CHRISTIANS WHATSOEVER TILL BY THEMSELVES—

What has been said of this custom of pouring or sprinkling water in the ordinary use of baptism, is to be understood only in reference to these Western parts of Europe: for it is used ordinarily nowhere else. The Greek Church, in all the branches of it, does still use immersion; and they hardly count a child, except in case of sickness, well baptized without it. And so do all other Christians in the world, except the Latins. That which I hinted before, is a rule that does not fail in any particular that I know of; viz. All the nations of Christians, that do now, or formerly did submit to the authority of the Bishop of Rome, do ordinarily baptize their infants by pouring, or sprinkling. And though the English received not this custom till after the decay of Popery, yet they have since received it from such neighbour nations as had began it in the time of the Pope's power. *But all other Christians in the world, who never owned the Pope's usurped power, DO, AND EVER DID, DIP THEIR INFANTS IN THE ORDINARY USE.*" *Hist. of Inf. Bap.* Part II. Chap. ix. p. 463, 467, 470, 471, 472, 477.

24. ANONYMOUS: "The custom of sprinkling children, instead of dipping them in the font, which at first was allowed in case of the weakness or sickness of the infant, has so far prevailed that immersion is

**CHAP. VII.] Of sprinkling instead of immersion.** ~~It~~  
 at length quite excluded. What principally tended  
 to confirm the practice of affusion or sprinkling was,  
 that several of our Protestant divines, flying into Ger-  
 many and Switzerland during the bloody reign of  
 queen MARY, and returning home when queen ELI-  
 ZABETH came to the crown, brought back with  
 them a great zeal for the Protestant churches beyond  
 sea, where they had been sheltered and received; and  
 having observed, that at Geneva and some other  
 places baptism was administered by sprinkling, they  
 thought they could not do the church of England a  
 greater piece of service than by introducing a prac-  
 tice dictated by so great an oracle as CALVIN. This,  
 together with the coldness of our Northern climate,  
 was what contributed to banish entirely the practice  
 of dipping infants in the font.' *Encyclopæd. Bruen.*  
 Article, BAPTISM. Vol. II. p 196.

## R E F L E C T I O N S.

REFLECTING on the quotation here produced  
 from eminent Protestant writers we are taught, that the  
 most ancient instance on ecclesiastical records, which  
 is yet adduced, of pouring or sprinkling, is that of  
 NOVAIAN, in the year two hundred and fifty one.  
 No. 23.—That the reason of it, both then and after-  
 wards, was not any real, nor even pretended com-  
 mand or example in the New Testament, but a sup-  
 posed necessity, arising, either from bodily disease, a  
 want of water for immersion, or some other similar  
 circumstance. No. 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 16, 20.—That  
 even then, the water was not applied by pouring upon,  
 or sprinkling the face, but the whole body. No. 2 —  
 That it was considered as an imperfect administration

of the ordinance; so imperfect, as rendered the subject of it ineligible to the ministerial office, and was denominated *sprinkling*, not *baptizing*. No. 2, 23.—That pouring, or sprinkling, as a common practice, originated in the apostate Church of Rome, and that the Protestant churches thence derived it. No. 21, 23.—That this mode of proceeding commenced among the English, in the time of Queen ELIZABETH; but that immersion was the prevailing practice till the reign of JAMES I. No. 21, 23.—That the reasons of this alteration in England were, the love of novelty, niceness of parents, pretence of modesty, and a high regard for the character of CALVIN. No. 21, 23, 24.—That CALVIN's form of administering the sacraments was probably the first in the world, that prescribed pouring absolutely. No. 23.—That sprinkling, strictly so called, did not commence in England, till the year sixteen hundred forty five, and was then used by very few. *Ibid.*—That the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, converted the font into a basin; and that basins, unless in case of necessity, had never been used by Papists, or any other Christians whatever, till by the members of that Assembly. *Ibid.*—That Roman Catholics ridicule some of the Protestant ministers, for using only a few drops of water. No. 22.—That the reasons assigned for this novel mode of proceeding are, coldness of climate; No. 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18: tenderness of infants; No. 5, 8, 13: Christianity not consisting in ceremonies; No. 6: that sacred maxim, *God will have mercy and not sacrifice*; No. 11, 12: the authority of the Church to alter ceremonial appointments; No. 22: and (most delicately to crown the whole) because, in the very act of baptizing, it was observed that *natura cursum suum tenet*. No. 13.—Finally, that ALL the Christians

**CHAP. VII.]** *Of sprinkling instead of Immersion.* No-  
 tians in the world, who never owned the Pope's  
 usurped power, now do, and ever did, dip their chil-  
 dren in the common course of their practice. No.  
 23. Such is the information which these learned au-  
 thors give.

REFLECT. II. According to this representation,  
 the practice of pouring and sprinkling makes but a  
 poor figure in the eyes of a consistent Protestant: for  
 if this be a just account, it had no existence till many  
 corruptions had taken deep root in the church; it ori-  
 ginated in dangerous error; was fostered by the Mo-  
 ther of abominations; and under the powerful influ-  
 ence of her authority and her example, it became  
 the general custom in all those parts of the world to  
 which her tyranny ever extended; BUT NO WHERE  
 ELSE. It seems to have been under the combined  
 operation of different errors that the practice took its  
 rise. For though, as Mr. HENRY justly observes,  
 'many in the primitive times, upon a mistaken ap-  
 'prehension of the unpardonableness of sin com-  
 'mitted after baptism, deferred it long; some even  
 'till the dying moment\*:' yet they imagined the or-  
 dinance necessary to their salvation. When there-  
 fore they were seized with affliction, confined to their  
 beds, and apprehensive of death; the expedient of  
 pouring, or of sprinkling, was devised in the pressing  
 emergency, as a happy succedaneum for immersion.  
 That laborious and learned enquirer, Dr. WÆL,  
 could find no instance of the kind, prior to the case  
 of NOVATIAN; which case is thus described in EU-  
 SEBIUS. 'He fell into a grievous distemper, and is  
 'being supposed that he would die immediately, he  
 'received baptism, being *befprinkled* with water on

\* *Treatise on Baptism*, p. 27.

'the bed whereon he lay, if that can be termed bap-  
 'tism \*.' On which passage VALESIIUS observes;  
 'This word, *περιχυσεις*, RUFINUS very well renders  
 'perfusus, besprinkled. For people which were sick  
 'and baptized in their beds, could not be dipped in  
 'water by the priest, but were sprinkled with water  
 'by him. This baptism was thought imperfect, and  
 'not solemn for several reasons. Also they who were  
 'thus baptized, were called ever afterwards, CLI-  
 'NICI; and, by the twelfth canon of the Council of  
 'Neocæsarea, these Clinici were prohibited priest-  
 'hood. Yea, so imperfect was this baptism esteemed,  
 'that Bp. TAYLOR tells us; 'It was a formal and so-  
 'lemn question, made by MAGNUS to CYPRIAN,  
 'Whether they are to be esteemed right Christians,  
 'who were only sprinkled with water, and not washed  
 'or dipped? He [CYPRIAN] answers, that baptism  
 'was good, when it was done in the case of necessity;  
 'God pardoning, and necessity compelling. And  
 'this, adds the Bishop, is the sense and law of the  
 'Church of England: not that it be indifferent, but  
 'that all infants be dipped, except in case of sickness,  
 'and then sprinkling is permitted †.—Now that this  
 'Clinical baptism had no existence in the apostolic  
 'times, we are led to conclude, not only by consider-  
 'ing the erroneous foundation on which it rests, and  
 'the total silence of the New Testament concerning it;  
 'but also by the testimony of some learned Pædobap-  
 'tists. Witness AITMANNUS, who says, 'It has not  
 'yet been proved, that the baptism of Clinics was  
 'used in the time of the Apostles; nor, certainly,  
 'can any passages be produced from the apostolic wri-  
 'tings, nor from those of the first Fathers, from which

\* *Eccles Hist* B VI Chap xliii. Cambridge, 1683. † *Duc-  
 tor Dubitantium*, B III. Chap iv. Rule 15.

it may be concluded, that it is a rite of such great antiquity \*.' See CHAP. IV., No. 84.

It is worthy to be remarked, that a gross mistake about the necessity of baptism, not only introduced sprinkling instead of immersion; but in some instances has operated so far as entirely to exclude water from any concern in the ordinance. The following examples have occurred to observation, in the course of my reading. NICEPHIORUS informs us, that a certain Jew, performing a journey in company with Christians, and being suddenly seized with a dangerous illness, earnestly desired baptism at the hands of his fellow travellers. They, not having a priest in their company, and being destitute of water, were at first reluctant. but he conjuring them not to deny him the favour, they yielded to his request. On which, taking off his clothes, they sprinkled him thrice with sand instead of water; adding, that they *baptized him, in the name of the Father*, and so on. —DEYLINGIUS furnishes another example of a singular kind. He tells us, that near the beginning of the Reformation, a certain midwife in Thuringia, under the fair pretext of necessity, baptized some sickly children without water, merely by pronouncing these words, *I baptize thee in the name*, and so on. The same learned author, from SECKENDORF, mentions others who taught that baptism might be administered without water †.—To BAPTIZE by sprinkling a few drops of water; to BAPTIZE by sprinkling of sand, without any water, to BAPTIZE by merely pronouncing a form of words, what misno-

\* *Meletem Philolog Critic* Tom. III p. 131.  
Centur. Magdeburg Cent II. C vi. p. 82.  
*Pastoral Pars III C iii § 20.*

† Apud  
‡ *De Prudentia*

296 *Reasons, Rise, and Prevalence* [CHAP. VII.  
 pers they are! and what an improvement on the in-  
 stitution of Christ!—I will here add the following  
 words of Dr. WILLET: ‘We condemn the foolish  
 ‘and ungodly practices and inventions of heretics,  
 ‘that either exclude water altogether, as the Mani-  
 ‘chees, with others; or do use any other element, as  
 ‘the Jacobites, that instead of water burned them that  
 ‘were to be baptized with an hot iron; or as the  
 ‘Ethiopians, which are called Abissines, that used  
 ‘fire instead of water; misconstruing the words of the  
 ‘Gospel, Matt. iii. 11 \*.’

REFLECT. III. The reasons assigned by these  
 Pædobaptists for pouring or sprinkling, may be com-  
 pared with the arguments of Roman Catholics, in de-  
 fence of withholding the cup from the people; with  
 the answers returned by Protestants to their futile rea-  
 sonings; and these, with the replies that Baptists make  
 to the reasonings in favour of sprinkling. Do the Ro-  
 man Catholics argue, That the *whole essence* of the  
 Lord’s supper is contained in one kind? So do Pro-  
 testant Pædobaptists, that the entire essence of baptism  
 is retained in pouring or sprinkling.—Do the former

† *Synopsis Papismi*, p. 562. ‘Our Brethren who practise Free  
 Communion frequently plead, that those persons whose claim to  
 the holy supper is under dispute, consider themselves as really bap-  
 tized, and on that ground should be admitted to the Lord’s table.  
 This reminds me of what VAUGHAN, a Popish casuist, says; ‘If  
 ‘any man think that to be a relic of a saint, which indeed is not so,  
 ‘he is not frustrate of the merit of his devotion.’ Thus that veteran  
 superstition, as quoted by Mr. CLARKSON, *Pract. Dir. of Papists*,  
 1799. But would our Brethren receive a candidate for commu-  
 nion, who sincerely believes he has been baptized, merely because  
 he was sprinkled with sand, as in the case of this Jew; or on ac-  
 count of some zealous midwife having pronounced over him a so-  
 lemn form of words, or because he has been marked with a hot  
 iron? Let them consider of it, take advice, and speak their minds,  
 Judges xix. 30.

maintain,

# CHAP. VII.] *Of Sprinkling instead of Immersion.* 197

maintain, that they who have the thing *signified*, need not contend about the *sign*? So do many of the *Father*.—Do the votaries of Rome tell us, there is no *spiritual benefit* enjoyed by receiving both bread and wine, which is not possessed by those who partake only of the bread? So do our Protestant Brethren argue, in reference to pouring and sprinkling, compared with immersion.—Do the subjects of the triple crown endeavour to persuade the Reformed, that there were various *types* and *figures* of the holy supper, in the Old Testament, which favour the receiving it in one kind? Do they plead for this end the paschal lamb, the manna, the show bread, and the sacrifices, the flesh of which was to be eaten, but their blood not to be drank? So Pædobaptists endeavour to persuade us, that some typical rites, and that various allusive expressions in the Old Testament (such as, *I will pour water on him that is thirsty—He shall sprinkle many nations*\*; with others of a similar kind,) are in favour of sprinkling.—Have Protestants united in replying to the first of these arguments, It is *not a fact*, that the whole essence of the Lord's supper is contained in the species of bread? So do we assert, that the entire essence of baptism is not retained in pouring, or sprinkling because an immersion of the whole body, is as really a distinct act from applying a few drops of water to the face only, as eating bread is distinct from the drinking of wine.—Do the Reformed answer the second, This is the ready way to *cast off* all sacraments and ordinances at once? So do we for if the servants of Christ may administer baptism in either the different ways, because the candidate is considered as having the blessings to which it refers, they are at

\* M<sup>r</sup> HENRY'S *Treatise on Bap* p. 140.



liberty for the same reason, to neglect or use any ordinance just as they please.—Do the opposers of Papal corruptions reply to the third; That supposing an equal degree of benefit resulting from each mode of administration, yet there is not, there cannot be the same degree of *humble obedience* to Jesus Christ, who appointed the sacred supper? So do we, in regard to the different ways of administering baptism.—Do the friends of the Protestant cause agree, in respect to the fourth argument; That none of the things mentioned were types or figures of the *Lord's supper*; and therefore the analogical reasoning has no force? We also maintain, that none of the purifications practised in the ancient Jewish church, (whether by dipping, washing, or sprinkling) were types or figures of baptism. Besides, we have the authority of a learned and famous Pædobaptist when we assert, That among all the various rites of purification prescribed to the chosen tribes, 'the sprinkling of *mere* water was not appointed; for it was either mixed with blood, or ashes\*.' Consequently, no allusion to any of those ancient rites, whether it be found in the Old, or in the New Testament, can be a proper direction for us in the administration of baptism. See CHAP. I. No. 4, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 20. REFLECT. II, III.

Again: When Protestant writers oppose that mutation of a divine appointment, which is practised by the use of the Romish communion at the Lord's table, they do not fail to show, That the *declared will* of God is the rule of duty; and that the institution of the ordinance, the example of the Apostles, the end of the appointment, and the practice of the church for thirteen hundred years, are all against that partial admi-

\* LAMPE, (comment. in Evang. Joan. ad Cap. iii. 5.

**CHAP. VII.] Of Sprinkling instead of Immersion.** ag-  
 nification, and all in favour of the Reformed\*. Now,  
 are not these the very principles on which the Baptists  
 proceed, in all their disputes with Pædobaptists about  
 the right manner of performing baptism? Nay, does  
 it not appear from the preceding Chapters, and from  
 the pens of our opponents themselves, that these prin-  
 ciples are just, and supported by facts, relating to the  
 controversy about baptism, as well as to that concern-  
 ing the holy supper?

Further: Do some of the learned Catholics ac-  
 knowledge, that receiving the Lord's supper in both  
 kinds, is more *complete* and more *expressive*; and that  
 the present practice of their church, is a *departure*  
 from the institution, from apostolic example, and from  
 the general custom of Christians for many ages? Do  
 certain of their learned writers express an ardent wish  
 to have the primitive practice restored among them †? All  
 this, it appears, have some of our learned opposers  
 done, in regard to the administration of baptism. How  
 far the following reflection upon a concession of  
 CASSANDER, concerning communion in one kind,  
 may be fairly applied to any of the Pædobaptists, I  
 leave my Reader to judge. 'Behold, says my author,  
 ' behold here an acknowledgment so plain and so full,  
 ' that I wonder with what countenance men can re-  
 ' sist so manifest a truth, and withhold it in unrighteous-  
 ' nefs! And yet here they muster up the best strength  
 ' they have, and will not yield an inch of what they  
 ' have once established, be it right or wrong ‡.'

\* See *Morning Exercise against Popery*, Sermon XXII. Dr. WIL-  
 LET's *Synops. Popismi*, Controv. XIII. Q. viii. p. 640---647. and  
 Mr LEIGH's *Bod. Div.* B. VIII. Chap. 15. † Dr. WILLET,  
 ut *supra*, p. 642 *Morning Exer. against Popery*, p. 772. ‡ *Morn-*  
*ing Exercise*, ibid.

Once more : Do not Protestant Pædobaptists urge the necessity of adhering, strictly adhering to the original institution, in administering the holy supper ; the absurdity and iniquity of departing from it, on account of any supposed inconvenience ; and the danger of practising any thing in religious worship that is not warranted by the word of God ? Hear a specimen of what they say, and see whither the reasoning tends : for it proceeds on principles that are common to every positive institution of true religion.—Thus Dr.

CLARKE : ‘ In things of external appointment, and mere positive institution, where we cannot, as in matters of natural and moral duty, argue concerning the natural reason and ground of the obligation, and the original necessity of the thing itself ; we have nothing to do but to obey the positive command. God is infinitely better able than we, to judge of the propriety and usefulness of the things he institutes ; and it becomes us to obey with humility and reverence \*.’—‘ The command of Christ, says the judicious TURRETTIN, ought not to be violated under any pretence whatever ; and in what way soever the thing signified may be received, the sign appointed by Christ is always to be retained †.’—‘ There is in the church, says HEIDEGGER, no more power of changing the rites of the sacraments appointed by Christ, than there is power of changing his word and law. For as his word contains a sign audible, so those rites contain a visible sign of his divine will ‡.’—‘ It is a universal axiom, says the learned and eminent CHAMIER, that the sacrament be celebrated according to its first institution §.’—‘ There being, in this whole institution, the

\* *Expos. Church Cat* p. 305, 306. † *Institut. Loc. XIX. Quæst. xxv. § 22.* ‡ In Dr. DU VEIL, on Acts viii. 38. § *Panstrat. Tom. IV. L. I. C. xiii. § 1.*

### CHAP. VIII. Of Sprinkling instead of Immersion.

‘ greatest simplicity and unity of design that can be,  
 ‘ says Bp. TAYLOR; the same form of words, a sin-  
 ‘ gle sacrament, the same address, no difference in the  
 ‘ sanction, no variety, or signs of variety, in the ap-  
 ‘ pendages, in the parallel places, or in any discourse  
 ‘ concerning it; to suppose here a difference will so  
 ‘ intricate the whole affair, that either men may ima-  
 ‘ gine and dream of variety when they please, and be  
 ‘ or not be obliged as they list; or else if there be a  
 ‘ difference intended in it by our Lawgiver, it will be  
 ‘ as good as none at all. He having left no mark of the  
 ‘ distinction, no shadow of different commandments,  
 ‘ under several representations \*.’—‘ All reasoning  
 ‘ upon this head, says Bp. BURNET, is an arguing  
 ‘ against the institution; as if Christ and his Apostles  
 ‘ had not well enough considered it, but that twelve  
 ‘ hundred years after them, a consequence should be  
 ‘ observed, that till then had not been thought of,  
 ‘ which made it reasonable to alter the manner of it—  
 ‘ He who instituted it, knew best what was most fit-  
 ‘ ting and most reasonable; and we must choose rather  
 ‘ to acquiesce in his commands, than in our own rea-  
 ‘ sonings †.’—‘ The institution, with the elements,  
 ‘ makes the sacrament; and so the only rule and ba-  
 ‘ lance for them [the elements] must needs be their  
 ‘ institution. This being the ground of this Ordinance,  
 ‘ no man or angel may violate under a fearful curse.  
 ‘ And indeed, if men’s will or wisdom might alter and  
 ‘ change the revelation of God, nothing would abide  
 ‘ firm in religion. ’Tis true, the laws of men may  
 ‘ be corrected and annulled, because they foresee not  
 ‘ their inconveniencies; but our Saviour, certainly,

\* *Ductor Dubitant.* B. III. Chap. vi. p. 412.    † *Expos.* XXXIX  
*Art.* p. 436, 437.

when he appointed this ordinance, well knew what was necessary and useful for his church to the end of the world. And for this reason the Apostle Paul, when some disorders were broken into the church of Corinth, in the use of the Lord's supper; he recalls them to the institution, and endeavours by that straight rule to rectify their irregularities, 1 Cor. xi. 23. By which place it is evident that there is no such way to obviate any mistake, which in after-times creeps upon God's own ordinance, as by going back to the spring, by considering the institution: insomuch as the same Apostle, for their violating Christ's institution in their administration of this ordinance, saith, *This is NOT to eat the Lord's supper* \*.—Dr ERSKINE, when answering an objection against frequently receiving the sacred supper, says, 'Whatever danger there is, God foresaw it, but yet did not see meet to guard against it, by enjoining us to communicate seldom. Shall we then pretend to be wiser than God? Have we found out better means for securing the honour of his institutions, than the means prescribed and practised by those who were under the infallible guidance of his Spirit? Have not attempts of this kind proved the source of the worst corruptions in Popery? Reason has no power to dispense with, or to derogate from the positive laws of God, on pretence of doing them a service. It is blasphemous presumption, though it may put on a cloak of humility, to judge that a sufficient reason to hinder thee from frequent communicating, which our Lord did not judge a sufficient reason to hinder him from commanding it. If thou thus judge the law, thou art not a doer of the law, but

\* *Morning Exercise against Popery*, p. 764, 765

'a judge.'

CHAP. VII.] *Of Sprinkling instead of Immersion.* 309

'a judge\*.'—Once more: The Church of England says, 'Before all other things this we must be sure of especially, that this supper be in such wise done and ministered, as our Lord and Saviour did and commanded to be done, as his holy Apostles used it, and the good Fathers in the primitive church frequented it. For, as that worthy man S. AMBROSE saith, *He is unworthy of the Lord, that otherwise doth celebrate that mystery, than it was delivered by him.* Neither can he be devout, that otherwise doth presume than it was given by the Author †.'—Quotations of this kind might be greatly multiplied; but I forbear, and appeal to the Reader, Whether these be not the very principles on which we proceed; nay, whether these be not some of those very arguments, *mutatis mutandis*, that are used by us against pouring and sprinkling? If then this way of arguing be valid from the pens of Protestants, against a mutilation of the holy supper; it must be equally so from the pen of a Baptist, in relation to the substitution of pouring, or sprinkling, instead of immersion. For if these arguments have any force, they will equally apply to every positive institution that is not administered according to its original form. We may therefore adopt the following observation of Dr. OWEN, respecting the cause of Nonconformity; 'We find as yet no arrows shot against us, but such as are gathered up in the fields, shot at them that use them, out of the Roman quiver ‡.'

Nor are the Roman Catholics insensible of that advantage which Pædobaptist Protestants give them, in regard to this affair; for thus BOSSUET reasons:

\* *Theolog. Dissert.* p. 289. † *Homily on the Sacram.* Part I. ‡ *Enquiry into the Orig. and Institut. of Churches*, Pref. p. 52.

Though these are incontestible truths, [namely, that baptism is immersion, and that immersion was practised by the Apostles,] yet neither we, nor those of the pretended Reformed religion, hearken to the Anabaptists, who hold immersion to be essential and indispensable; nor have either they or we feared to change this dipping, as I may say, of the whole body, into a bare aspersión, or infusion on one part of it. No other reason of this alteration can be rendered, than that this dipping is not of the *substance* of baptism; and those of the pretended Reformed religion agreeing with us in this, the first principle we have laid down is incontestible. The second principle is, That to distinguish in a sacrament what does or does not belong to the substance of it, we must consider the *essential efficacy* of the sacrament. Thus, although the word of Jesus Christ, *baptize*, as has been said, signifies dip; it has been thought, that the *efficacy* of the sacrament was not annexed to the *quantity* of water\*; so that baptism by infusion, and sprinkling, or by immersion, appearing in reality to have the same efficacy, both the one and the other mode is judged good. Now seeing, as we have said, we cannot find in the eucharist any essential efficacy of the body, distinguished from that of the blood; the grace of the one and of the other, as to the sum and substance of it, cannot but be the same. It signifies nothing to say, I he representation of the death of our Lord, is *more ex-*

\* So says Mr. HENRY, 'In sacraments, it is the truth and not the quantity of the outward element, that is to be insisted upon.' Here he inadvertently coincides with BOSSUET. In another place however he says, 'Strict conformity to the Scripture rule, without the superadded inventions of men, is the true beauty of Christian ordinance.' This is the language of a sound Protestant, and worthy of himself. See his *Treatise on Bap.* p. 139, 149.

## CHAP. VII.] *Of Sprinkling instead of Immersion.* 303

' *press* in the two kinds. I grant it: and in like manner the new birth of a believer, is *more express* in immersion, than in bare infusion, or aspersion. For the believer being plunged in the water of baptism, is *buried with Jesus Christ*, as the Apostle expresses it; (Rom. vi. 4. Col. ii. 12.) and coming out of the water, quits the tomb with his Saviour, and more perfectly represents the mystery of Jesus Christ, who regenerates him. Merſion, in which water is applied to the whole body and to all its parts, also more perfectly signifies, that a man is more fully and entirely washed from his defilements: and yet baptism performed by immersion, or plunging, is not better than that which is administered by simple infusion, and on one part only. 'Tis sufficient that the expression of the mystery of Jesus Christ, and the efficacy of grace, is found in substance in the sacrament, and the utmost exactness of representation is not required in it. Thus in the eucharist the expression of the death of our Lord, being in substance found in it, when that body which was delivered up for us is given to us; and the expression of the grace of the sacrament being also found in it, when the image of our spiritual nourishment is given us, under the species of bread; the blood, which only adds to it a more express signification, is not absolutely necessary \*.'

The same artful defender of Papal superstition, in another of his books, expresses himself thus: 'Baptism by immersion, which is as clearly established in the Scripture, as communion under the two kinds can possibly be; has nevertheless been changed into pouring, with as much ease and as little dispute, as

\* In Mr. STENNETT, *against* Mr. RUSSEN, p. 176---178.



communion under one kind has been established:  
 for there is the same reason why one should be pre-  
 served as the other. It is a fact most firmly believed  
 by the Reformed, (though some of them at this time  
 wrangle about it) that baptism was instituted to be  
 administered by plunging the body entirely; that  
 Jesus Christ received it in this manner; that it was  
 thus performed by his Apostles; that the Scriptures  
 are acquainted with no other baptism; that anti-  
 quity understood and practised it in this manner;  
 and that to baptize, is to plunge;—these facts, I say,  
 are unanimously acknowledged by all the Reformed  
 teachers; by the Reformers themselves; by those  
 who best understood the Greek language, and the  
 ancient customs of both Jews and Christians; by  
 LUTHER, by MELANCHTON, by CALVIN, by  
 CASAUBON, by GROTIUS, with all the rest, and  
 since their time by JURIEU, the most ready to con-  
 tradict of all their ministers. LUTHER has even  
 remarked, that—this sacrament is called *Tauf*, in  
 German, on account of the depth; because they  
 plunged *deeply* in the water, those whom they bap-  
 tized. If then there be in the world a fact abso-  
 lutely certain, it is *this*. Yet it is no less certain,  
 that with all these authors, baptism without immer-  
 sion is considered as lawful; and that the church  
 properly retains the custom of pouring—There is,  
 then, the same foundation for continuing the com-  
 munion under one kind, as to continue baptism by  
 pouring; and the church in supporting these two  
 customs, which tradition proves are equally indif-  
 ferent, has not done any thing unusual; but main-  
 tained, against troublesome persons, that authority  
 upon which the faith of the ignorant rests \*.—I am

\* *Hist. des Eglises Protest.* Tom. II. p. 469, 470.

reminded here of a remark made by Mr. JAMES OWEN, concerning Episcopacy; which with a slight alteration will apply to the case before us. These are his words: 'Our English episcopacy hath scarce one argument for its defence, but what will indifferently serve the Popish prelacy\*.'

Our English Episcopalians also do not fail to argue on the same topic, when defending their hierarchy, and various rites, against the objections of Pædobaptist Dissenters. Thus, for example, Bp. BURNET, after having mentioned several things which he thought for his purpose, proceeds: 'To these instances another may be added, that must needs press all that differ from us, one body only excepted, very much. We know that the first ritual of baptism, was by going into the waters, and being laid as dead all along in them; and then the persons baptized were raised up again, and so they came out of them. This is not only mentioned by St. Paul, but in two different places he gives a mystical signification of this rite; that it signified our being *buried with Christ in baptism*, and our being *raised up with him to a new life*; so that the phrases, of *rising with Christ*, and of *putting on Christ*, as oft as they occur, do plainly relate to this: and yet, partly out of modesty, partly in regard to the tenderness of infants, and the coldness of these climates, since such a manner might endanger their lives, and we know that God *loves mercy better than sacrifice*, this form of baptizing is as little used by those [Pædobaptists] who separate from us, as by ourselves—from all these things this inference seems just, I hat according to the practices of those who divide from us, the church must be supposed to have an

\* *Plea for Scrip Ordinat.* p. 17, 171.

\* authority

authority to adjust the forms of our religion, in those parts of them that are merely ritual, to the taste, to the exigencies and conveniences of the several ages and climates \*.'—The right reverend prelate here speaks out. He talks like one who heartily believes, that 'the church hath power to decree rites or ceremonies.' This will do almost as well, so far as the ritual part of religion is concerned, as the claim of infallibility, of a dispensing power, and the pretence of unwritten apostolic tradition, which are advanced by the partisans of another communion. Such, however, is the Bishop's avowal; and such he insists upon it is the implicit language of those Dissenters who practise pouring or sprinkling instead of immersion. What a pity but the church, under the ancient Jewish Œconomy, had been acquainted with this doctrine of *taste*, of *exigence*, and of *convenience*, relating to the ceremonial part of divine worship! What a pity but the hoary Abraham had well understood it, when he received an order to circumcise himself and his male posterity! for had he known and approved of it, he would certainly have performed the rite on a different part from that which Jehovah specified. What shall I say? this doctrine of taste, of exigence, and of convenience is of such extensive application, that it would have saved the venerable ancients a world of trouble, and screened them from a thousand reproaches of their Gentile neighbours, had it been duly improved: because, as God *is in one mind*, it cannot be doubted that *he loved mercy better than sacrifice* in those early times as well as now.

\* *Four Discourses to the Clergy*, p. 281, 282. Compare this with what he says, *Epist. of XXXIX Art.* p. 436, 437, as quoted before p. 304.

But

**CHAP. VII.] *Of Sprinkling instead of Immersion.* 309**

But let us hear another learned Episcopalian or two in reference to the same subject. Thus, then, Mr. EVANS, when defending a kneeling gesture at the Lord's table. ' There is a confessed variation allowed of, and practised by the generality of Dissenters, both Presbyterians and Independents, from the institution and practice of Christ and his Apostles, in the other sacrament of baptism. For they have changed immersion or dipping, into aspersion or sprinkling, and pouring water on the face. Baptism by immersion or dipping, is suitable to the institution of our Lord and the practice of his Apostles, and was by them ordained and used to represent our burial with Christ, a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness, as St. Paul explains that rite. Matt. iii. 16. and xxviii. 19. Rom. vi. 4, 6, 11. Col. ii. 12. Now it is very strange that kneeling at the Lord's supper (though a different gesture from that which was used at the first institution) should become a stumbling-block in the way of weak and tender consciences, that it is more unpassable than the Alps; and yet they can with ease and cheerfulness pass by as great or a greater change in the sacrament of baptism, and christen as we do, without the least murmuring or complaint. Sitting, kneeling, or standing, were none of them instituted or used to signify and represent any thing essential to the Lord's supper, as dipping all over was: why cannot kneeling then be without any wrong to the conscience, as safely and innocently used as sprinkling? How comes a gnat (to use our Saviour's proverb) to be harder to swallow than a camel? Or why should not the peace and unity of the church, and charity to the public, prevail with them to kneel at the Lord's supper, as much,

or

' or rather more, as mercy and tenderness to the in-  
 ' fant's body, to sprinkle or pour water on the face,  
 ' contrary to the first institution \* ? '——Thus Dr.  
 WHITBY: ' If notwithstanding the evidence pro-  
 ' duced, that baptism by immersion is suitable both to  
 ' the institution of our Lord and his Apostles; and  
 ' was by them ordained to represent our burial with  
 ' Christ, and so our dying unto sin, and our conformi-  
 ' ty to his resurrection by newness of life, as the  
 ' Apostledoth clearly maintain the meaning of this rite:  
 ' I say, if notwithstanding this, all our [Pædobaptist]  
 ' Dissenters do agree to sprinkle the baptized infant;  
 ' why may they not as well submit to the significant  
 ' ceremonies imposed by our Church? For since it is  
 ' as lawful to add unto Christ's institutions a significant  
 ' ceremony, as to diminish a significant ceremony  
 ' which He or his Apostles instituted, and use another  
 ' in its stead, which they never did institute; what rea-  
 ' son can they have to do the latter, and yet refuse sub-  
 ' mission to the former? And why should not the  
 ' peace and union of the church be as prevailing with  
 ' them to perform the one, as is their mercy to the in-  
 ' fant's body to neglect the other † ? '——Hence the  
 Reader may plainly perceive, how much the practice  
 of aspersion is calculated to embarrass Protestants, in  
 their disputes with Papists; and Nonconformists, in  
 their controversies with Episcopalians.

REFLECT. IV. Admitting the tenderness of in-  
 fants to be a sufficient reason for not immersing  
 them, what is the natural inference? That they should  
 be sprinkled, or have water poured upon them? By  
 no means; but that our divine Legislator does not

\* *Cases to Recover Dissenters*, Vol. III. p. 105, 106. Edit. 3d.

† *Protestant Reconciler*, p. 289. See also Bp. STILLINGFLEET'S  
*Trenicum*, Part II. p. 345.

require them to be baptized. For as our opposers themselves have proved it, we must insist that baptism is immersion. Consequently, were it evinced that infants cannot bear plunging, without the hazard of health and of life; it would only be a presumptive argument against their claim to the ordinance: and the greater the danger, the stronger the presumption; for our opponents inform us, that a natural incapacity will always excuse \*.—That it is better to omit a positive ordinance than to perform it contrary to divine appointment, Pædobaptists themselves assure us. Thus the famous BUDDEUS: ‘Persons who cannot drink wine, had better entirely abstain from the sacred supper than receive it under one species only †.’ DEYLINGIUS: ‘It is better entirely to abstain from using the holy supper, than receive it contrary to the appointment of Christ ‡. Mr. BLAKE: ‘Omissions seem better to me, than a prohibited, or a disorderly proceeding, expressly against a command, or ordinance of Jesus Christ. The ark had better stayed where it was, than a new cart should have carried it in that disorder to the place appointed for it. Better that Saul and Uzziah had let sacrifice alone, than any to whom it did not appertain should have undertaken it—I never saw sufficient reason given, that a man should break an express rule, rather than omit a duty of mere positive institution. Jeroboam must rather have no sacrifice, than that Dan and Bethel should be the place for it §.’ Mr. BRADBURY: ‘It is better, I think, to leave such a duty [as baptism] undone, than not to have it well done. God never expects it either from you or me,

\* *Morning Exercise against Popery*, p. 771. † *Theolog. Moral.* Pars III. C. iii. § 77. ‡ *De Prudent. Pastoral.* Pars III. C. v. § 16. § *Covenant Scaled*, p. 255, 256.

when he has thrown a bar in our way, that we should break it, or leap over it. To which I may add, better that the Israelites entirely omitted circumcision while in the wilderness, than to have circumcised a finger instead of the foreskin. So in the present case: better omit baptism entirely, than practise pouring or sprinkling.

But whether, in these colder climates, and in common cases, there be any reason to consider health as endangered by the practice of immersion, let Pædobaptists themselves declare. That learned physician, Sir JOHN FLOYER, gives his opinion on the subject without reserve, both in a theological and medical point of light. Among many other things, he says: 'I do here appeal to you, [the Dean and Canons, Residentiaries of the cathedral church of Litchfield] as person's well versed in the ancient history, and canons, and ceremonies of the Church of England; and therefore are sufficient witnesses of the matter of fact which I design to prove; viz. That immersion continued in the church of England till about the year sixteen hundred. And from hence I shall infer, That if God and the church thought that practice innocent for sixteen hundred years, it must be accounted an unreasonable nicety in this present age, to scruple either immersion or cold bathing, as dangerous practices. Had any prejudice usually happened to infants by the trine immersion, that custom could not have continued so long in this kingdom. We must always acknowledge, that He that made our bodies, would never command any practice prejudicial to our healths; but, on the contrary, he best knows what will be most for the preservation of our healths, and

# CHAP. VII.] *Of Sprinkling instead of Immersion.* 313

‘ does frequently take great care both of our bodies  
 ‘ and souls, in the same command \*.’—This eminent  
 physician endeavours to show, as Dr. WALL observes,  
 ‘ by reasons taken from the nature of our bodies, from  
 ‘ the rules of medicine, from modern experiences, and  
 ‘ from ancient history, that washing or dipping infants  
 ‘ in cold water, is generally speaking not only safe,  
 ‘ but very useful: and that though no such rite as bap-  
 ‘ tism had been instituted, yet reason and experience  
 ‘ would have directed people to use cold bathing, both  
 ‘ of themselves and their children: and that it has in  
 ‘ all former ages so directed them. For—he shows,  
 ‘ that’ all civilized nations, the Egyptians, Greeks,  
 ‘ Romans, and so on, made frequent use of it, and  
 ‘ gave great commendations of it. and that nature it-  
 ‘ self has taught this custom to many barbarous na-  
 ‘ tions; the old Germans, Highlanders, Irish, Japan-  
 ‘ ese, Tartars, and even the Samoeds, who live in the  
 ‘ coldest climate that is inhabited—He prognosticates  
 ‘ that the old modes in physie and religion will in time  
 ‘ prevail, when people have had more experience in  
 ‘ cold baths, and that the approbation of physicians  
 ‘ would bring in the old use of immersion in baptism †’  
 —Dr. CHUTE thus: ‘ I cannot forbear recommend-  
 ‘ ing cold bathing; and I cannot sufficiently admire  
 ‘ how it should ever have come into such disuse, es-  
 ‘ pecially among Christians, when commanded by the  
 ‘ greatest lawgiver that ever was, under the direction  
 ‘ of God’s Holy Spirit, to his chosen people, and perpe-  
 ‘ tuated to us in the immersion at baptism, by the same  
 ‘ Spirit; who with infinite wisdom in this, as in every  
 ‘ thing else that regards the temporal and eternal felicity

\* *Hist of Cold Bathing*, p 11, 51.  
 Chap ix. p 476, 477.

† *Hist. Inf. Eap.* Part II.



city of his creatures, combines their duty with their happiness. — To the decided opinion of these medical authors, relating to the salutary tendency of cold bathing, we may add the suffrage of that great philosopher Lord BACON, who speaks as follows: ‘It is strange that the use of bathing, as a part of diet, is left. With the Romans and Græcians it was as usual as eating, or sleeping; and so it is amongst the Turks at this day †.’ Thus Dr. FRANKLIN: ‘Damp, but not wet linen, may possibly give colds; but no one catches cold by bathing, and no clothes can be wetter than water itself ‡.’ To all which I will subjoin the following attestation of a nameless opponent: ‘A child may with as much propriety, and commonly with equal safety to its health, be baptized by immersion, as an adult §.’ See CHAP. V. No. 7.

But supposing there were both difficulty and danger attending the performance of our Lord’s positive command, Pædobaptists would still assure us that we must submit without repining, and without hesitation. Thus for example, Dr. SHERLOCK: ‘If an express law may be disobeyed, as often as men fancy they see reason to do what the law forbids, this overthrows the whole authority of making laws, and makes every subject a judge whether the laws of a sovereign prince should be obeyed or not. At this rate, he has the greatest authority who has the best reason; and since every man believes his own reason to be best, every man is the sovereign lord of his own actions. It is to be presumed that no prince makes a law, but what he apprehends some reason

*Essay on Health*, p. 100, 101.    † In Dr. STENNETT’S *Answer*  
to Mr. ADDINGTON, Part I. p. 34.    ‡ *Letters and Papers on Various Subjects*, p. 460.    § *Simple Truth, or A Plea for Infants*, p. 2.

for; and to oppose any man's private reason against a law, is to set up a private man's reason against the public reason of government: and yet it is much worse to oppose our reason against a divine law; which is to oppose the reason of creatures against the reason of God: unless we will say, that God makes laws without reason; and those who can believe that, may as easily imagine that those laws which he makes without reason, should be obeyed without reason also; and then, to be sure, all their reasons cannot repeal a law, nor justify them in the breach of it. It becomes every creature to believe the will of God to be the highest reason; and therefore when God has declared his will by an express law, while his law continues in force—it is an *impudent* thing to urge our reasons against the obligations of it—Especially, when the matter of the law is such [as it is in positive institutions] that whatever reasons may be pretended on one side or other, it must be acknowledged to be wholly at the will and pleasure of the lawgiver which side he will choose—That no reason or arguments can absolve us from our obedience to an express law till it be—repealed, appears from this; That our obligation to obedience does not depend merely upon the *reason* of the law, but upon the *authority* of the lawgiver; and therefore though the reason of the law should cease, yet while it is enforced by the same authority it obliges still \*. —PUFFIN-  
DORF shows, and I suppose it is generally agreed, that laws do not oblige because they are *good*, but because the legislator has a *right* to command: and that objection arises to the express words of a law, on account of the requisition seeming to be hard in some

\* *Preservative against Popery*, Title vii. p. 21.

particular instances. — Mr. CHARNOCK says, 'They must be evasions past understanding, that can hold water against a divine order—God never gave power to any man to change his ordinances, or to dispense with them †.' — Surely it is enough, says Abp. SECKER, that He is Lord and King of the whole earth, and that all his dealings with the works of his hands are just and reasonable. Our business is to obey, and trust him with the consequences ‡.' — No circumstances of prudence or conveniency, says Dr. HUNTER, can ever be with propriety urged as a dispensation with a clearly commanded duty—Observe the delicacy, and the danger of admitting a latitude and a liberty in sacred things. In what concerns the conduct of human life, in our intercourse one with another as the citizens of this world, many things must be left to be governed by occasions and discretion; but in what relates to the immediate worship of God, and where the mind of the Lord has been clearly made known, to assume and exercise a dispensing power is criminal and hazardous. The tabernacle must be constructed, to the minutest pin and loop, according to the pattern delivered in the mount. If Uzah presume to put forth his hand to support the tottering ark, it is at his peril. A holy and a jealous God will be served only by the persons, and in the manner which he himself has appointed—When the great Jehovah condescends to become a legislator, the utmost extent of possibility lying open to his view, *provision is made from the beginning for every case*

*Law of Nature and Nations*, B. I. Chap. vi. § 1, 17. B. V. Chap. i. § 24. † *Works*, Vol. II. p. 763, 773. Full Edit. ‡ *Lectures on the Catechism*, Lect. II.

CHAP. VII. *Of Sprinkling instead of Baptism.*

• *that can happen* \*.—A Deistical writer, having objected against circumcision, on account of the pain and danger attending it, Dr. WATERLAND replies

• The presumption which the author goes upon is,

• that he is wise enough to direct the counsels of Heaven, and to pass an unerring judgment upon all the

• works and ways of God. It is a fact that God did require

• circumcision: and *who art thou that repliest against*

• *God?* Even Mr. BAYLE might teach this author,

• *that when we are certain God does such or such a thing,*

• *'tis blasphemy to say it's useless.* God has his own

• reasons. This writer might be certain of the fact,

• if any historical fact whatever can be made certain.

• —Surely, says Mr. TOWGOOD, the supreme Bishop

• and only Head of his church, well knew what institutions were most for its edification, and what ceremonies and rites would best promote the order and decency of its worship; and either by himself, or by his inspired Apostles, has left a perfect plan of both. For

• any weak uninspired men therefore to rise up in

• after ages, and fancy they can improve the scheme

• of worship which Christ hath left; that they can add

• greatly to its beauty, its splendour and perfection by

• some ceremonies of their own, is, to be sure, a rude

• invasion of Christ's throne, which every sober Christian ought highly to detest †.—Remarkable, and quite

in point, is the declaration of Dr. OWEN. • That

• divine Revelation is the only foundation, the only

• law, and the only rule of all religious worship that is

• pleasing to God, or accepted by him, is a maxim of

• the last importance in divinity—This maxim teaches,

• that every thing appointed by God in his worship,

\* *Sacred Biography*, Vol. III. p. 93, 94, 362, 363, 435. † *Scripture Vindicated*, Part I. p. 63, 64. ‡ *Dissert. Gent. Letters*, Lott, iii. p. 10, 11.

‘however absurd, or difficult, or unprofitable, it may seem to reason; is to be regarded and performed with the deepest reverence and submission, on account of that supreme authority which appointed and required it\*.’—To these testimonies I will add that of BERNARD: *Non attendit verus obediens, QUALE sit quod præcipitur; hoc solo contentus QUIA PRÆCIPITUR.*

Mr. HENRY has observed, that circumcision was ‘a painful and bloody rite†.’ So the wife of Moses considered it; but yet Abraham and his posterity were bound to observe it, on the peril of Jehovah’s keen displeasure. Concerning that sanguinary ceremony, Pædobaptists have spoken their minds very freely. M. SAURIN, for instance, tells us; ‘The command of circumcision did, without doubt, frighten those who first received it; it was dangerous to grown persons in hot countries: but for an old man to receive the token of circumcision in so advanced an age, was in all appearance to be put out of the condition of seeing himself a father—The pain which circumcision produced was extremely sensible, especially to grown people; this we may infer from the example of the Shechemites‡.’ QUENSTEDIUS: ‘Circumcision was a work full of pain, as PHILO asserts; which appears by the history of the Shechemites, Gen. xxxiv. 25. Hence Zippora, having circumcised her son, said to Moses, *A bloody husband art thou to me*—As if she had said, This rite of thy nation forces me to shed blood. Exod. iv. 25 §.’ BUCANUS: ‘Circumcision could not be performed

\* *Theologoumena*, L. IV. C. iii. Digress. III. p. 326. † *Treatise on Bap.* p. 12. ‡ *Dissertat. upon the Old Test.* Vol. I. p. 141, 143. § *Antiq. Bit.* Pars I. C. iii. p. 269, 270.

CHAP. VII. *Of Sprinkling instead of Immersion.* 319

‘without putting the infant to most exquisite pain\*.’

SIR JOHN CHARDIN: ‘I have heard from divers  
‘renegadoes in the East who had been circumcised,  
‘some at thirty, some at forty years of age, that the  
‘circumcision had occasioned them a great deal of  
‘pain, and that they were obliged to keep their bed  
‘upon it, at least twenty or twenty-two days†.’ Mr.

FINDLAY: ‘MAIMONIDES having said, *Circum-*  
‘*cision was a rite of such a nature, that no person*  
‘*would perform it upon himself or his children, but on*  
‘*account of religion*; gives the reason of his judg-  
‘ment: ‘*For it is not a slight hurt of the leg, or burn-*  
‘*ing of the arm, but a thing MOST HARSH and UN-*  
‘*EASY*—So likewise PHILO speaks of circumcision,  
‘as an operation attended with grievous anguish. It  
‘may even seem to have been hazardous to life. For  
‘LIGHTFOOT, in his *Exercitationes* upon 1 Cor. vii.  
‘19. produces some passages from Rabbinical writ-  
‘ings, in which mention is made of a man whose bre-  
‘thren had died of circumcision. Nay, one from the  
‘Jerusalem Talmud itself, where R. NATHAN says,  
‘*There was a woman in Cesarea of Cappadocia, who*  
‘*had lost three sons successively by it*†.’ Now can any  
thing like this be asserted with propriety concerning  
the baptismal immersion? Yet Abraham, who first  
received the command, readily obeyed: for he cir-  
cumcised himself and his son Ishmael, together with  
all the males that were born in his house, or boug  
with his money, on the *very day* he received the  
vine order§.

\* *Theolog. Loc.* I oc. XVI. § 31.  
*Observations*, Vol. II. p. 498, 499.

† In Mr. HARMER’S  
† *Vindicat. of the Sacred*

*Books*, p. 278. Note. Vid. GUSSETII *Comment. Fb.* sub Rad. מר  
and SCHUCHZERI *Physica Sacra*, p. 93, 450. Aug. *Vindiciae* 1731.  
§ GEN. xvii. 23, 24.

In regard to the supposed *indecenty* of plunging, about which a hideous outcry is often raised, as if that of itself were a sufficient conviction of our practice proceeding on a gross mistake, we answer with Mr. BAXTER, in another case, 'It is GOD'S way, and \* then no inconvenience will disgrace it \*.' Some of the Romish casuists have told us, indeed, that it is no sin to break a divine law, if it be very difficult to keep, if we should be thought fools for observing it; or if the observance of it would be accounted ridiculous † but we dare not place much dependence on their determination. Besides, whatever of this kind is objected by our Brethren, would have applied with incomparably greater force against the ancient rite of circumcision. But let us hear what Pædobaptists themselves have said concerning this particular CALVIN. 'This command, *Ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin*, might at first sight appear extremely \* absurd and ridiculous ‡.' WITSIUS having described the painful rite, expresses himself thus, 'On \* account of which ceremony, the Jews were con- \* temptuously and by way of reproach called, *Apellæ*, \* and *Recutiti*; because they wanted that pellicle or \* little skin. But it pleased God, to confound all \* carnal wisdom, and to try the faith and obedience of \* his people, to appoint a rite for the seal of his cove- \* nant, at which they might blush, and be almost \* ashamed of performing it' like as he founded our whole salvation in a fact which seems no less shameful to the flesh, namely, the cross of Christ §' HEIDEGGERUS: 'God, according to his unsearchable

\* *Disputat. of Rite & Sacram* p 32

† *Præf. Diss. of P. pists*, p 385, 386

‡ 11.

§ *Obser. Fæd.* L. IV C. viii. § 2. *Ægyptiaca*, L. III.

C. vii § 4.

¶ 11.

† In Mr CLARK-

‡ In Gen xvii

\* wisdom,

## CHAP. VII.] *Of Sprinkling instead of Immersion.*

' wisdom, appointed a rite so much to be blushed at  
' to be a type of what was yet more shameful; namely,  
' the cross of Christ \*.' BUDDIUS: ' The rite of  
' circumcision, considered in itself, was contemptible,  
' and almost shameful †.' F. FABRICIUS: ' Circum-  
' cision, I confess, considered externally, that is, with-  
' out a divine institution, and without the design and  
' signification of that institution, might seem to be an  
' exceedingly ridiculous and shameful rite ‡.' Nay, were  
not some other appointments of Jehovah, under the  
Jewish Economy, such as the customs of our coun-  
try, and present prevailing notions of, the rational,  
the decent, and the useful; would lead many persons  
to consider, as puerile, indelicate, and unprofitable?  
Such, if I mistake not, were several of those laws  
which related to ceremonial impurity: and yet the  
posterity of Abraham, of both sexes, were obliged to  
regard them with strict punctuality. It must therefore  
be at our peril to pronounce that *indecent* which  
God requires §.—But why such complaints of indeli-  
cacy against the baptismal plunging, as performed in  
public assemblies? What immodesty is there in the  
solemn immersion of candidates for baptism, when  
properly clothed; any more than in the public and  
promiscuous bathing of both sexes, at Bath, South-  
ampton, or any other place of a similar kind ||? As  
to the baptizing of persons that are not properly  
clothed, it has our cordial disapprobation.

Further: For any of our opposers to imagine that  
pouring, or sprinkling, is *lawful*, without being *ne-  
cessary*; or that it is necessary *now* and in *these* coun-

\* *Corp Theolog.* I or XII. § 86. † *Theolog. Doct.* L. IV.

C. 1 § 15 ‡ *Christology*, Dissert. XI. § 16. § Vid.

FRIDERICI *Dub. Vexat.* p. 310. Lips. 1685. || See Dr.

SIENNATI's *Ans.* to Dr. ADDINGTON, Part I. p. 31, 32. Note.



## Reasons Rise, and Prevalence [CHAP. VII.]

tries, though not so in the apostolic times and in the Eastern parts, is unbecoming the character of any Protestant. Remarkable are the words and forcible is the argument of Dr. WILLET, when he says; 'If it be not *necessary* to receive [the Lord's supper] in one kind, it is not to be done *at all*. For, either it is agreeable to the institution of Christ, to receive in one kind, or disagreeable. If it be agreeable and prescribed, it is of necessity to be observed. If it be not prescribed, it is of necessity not to be used at all\*.' This will apply, with all its force, to the subject before us.—The celebrated MONTESQUIEU's reasoning will also apply in the present case. 'It is in the nature of human laws to be subject to all the accidents which can happen, and to vary in proportion as the will of man changes; on the contrary, by the nature of the laws of religion, they are never to vary. Human laws appoint for some good; those of religion for the best: good may have another object, because there are many kinds of good; but the best is but one: it cannot therefore change. We may change [human] laws, because they are reputed no more than good; but the institutions of religion are always supposed to be the best†.'—Thus Mr. ARCH. HALL: 'All that concerns the glory of God [and the honour of his church] is unerringly and unalterably settled in the word of God, which is *not yea and nay*. It does not accommodate its doctrines to succeeding periods of time; nor to the changing tempers, humours, or fashions of place; like its divine Author, it is the same *yesterday, and to-day, and for ever*‡.'

*Synopsis Papiſmi*, p. 643.

† *Spirit of Laws*, B. XXVI.

Chap. ix.

‡ *Gospel Church*, p. 52.

LATOMUS having represented the first Christian churches as in a rude, uncultivated state, while the people received both kinds at the Lord's table; but as omitting the wine in following ages, when they were better taught and more polished; CHAMIER exclaims, ' Shall I be silent? or shall I refute him? ' For, verily, the absurdity is of such a magnitude ' that every one may see it, and guard against its influence without my assistance \*.' One of our Dissenting Brethren also, when engaged in the Popish controversy, says; ' Let us consider, Things necessary—at one time, and not at another? Necessary in our days, and not so in the days of the Apostles? ' Necessary to Christians of later ages, and not so to the primitive Christians? Sure, this cannot be true: ' I always thought that to be the Christian faith, which ' was once, and *at once* delivered to the saints, by ' Christ and his Apostles †.—Again: For any to practise aspersion, on a presumption that it includes the whole essence of baptism, and to avoid supposed indecency, even while they acknowledge that immersion was appointed by Christ and used by the Apostles; is to impeach the wisdom of our divine Lawgiver, by implicitly saying, That he did not well consider to what a pitch the refined and virtuous delicacy of his disciples would arise in our modern times. ' As ' if, says Mr. BINGHAM, Christ himself could not have ' foreseen any dangers that might happen, or given ' as prudent orders as the Pope concerning his own ' institution ‡.' It is to proceed on the same foundation with the Council of Constance, when forbidding the use of the sacred cup to the people: for that pro-

\* *Panstrat.* Tom. IV. L. VIII. C. x. § 24, 25. † Mr. SMYTH'S *Serm.* at *Salter's Hall*, on the *Church of Rome's Claim of Infallibility*. p. 30, 31. ‡ *Origines Ecclæs.* B. XV. Chap. iii. § 34.

tion was founded on a supposition, that communicants receive the entire body and blood of Christ, under the species of bread; and it was intended to preclude certain dangers and scandals, supposed to arise from the ancient practice\*. The members of that Council, it seems, discovered something as *dangerous* and as *offensive*, in administering both species at the holy table; as others do, in the baptismal immersion: and they were equally unwilling to acknowledge that the substance of the sacred supper was at all impaired by their innovation. But would any authority on earth bear, without marks of displeasure, to be treated in a similar manner? We will suppose, for example, that a subject, or a servant, neglects the law of a magistrate, or the command of a master; we will further suppose him called to account for his disobedience, and that in his own vindication he says: 'I considered the precise performance of the order as of little importance; provided it were but *substantially* observed. I have therefore substituted something in its room that will do quite as well, without being attended with such inconveniencies as would have been inseparable from a punctual compliance.' Would this be thought a modest excuse, or a just vindication? It may be answered, in that obsolete phrase of our biblical version, *I throw not*.

Once more: As the primitive immersion has been laid aside for pouring or sprinkling, upon a supposi-

\* Vid CARANZÆ *Sum Concil.* p 389 LOVAN 1681 VENEM. *Hist Eccles* Tom VI p 193 The learned CHEMNITIVS, when exploding the futile reasons of Roman Catholics for withholding the cup from the people, among other things observes, 'I heir arguments reproach the Author of the Sacrament himself, who instituted it so that it cannot be observed in the church without danger of scandal — The church is now become exceedingly delicate.' *Concil. Trident.* p 8, 309.

CHAP. VII.] *Of Sprinkling instead of Immersion.*

tion of its being dangerous and indecent; so kneeling at the Lord's table has been substituted for a table gesture, and is defended under a fair pretext that the latter is a bold and saucy posture. Dr. NICHOLS, when vindicating the practice of his own communion, and when showing that various of our festival customs are improper to be used at the holy table, has the following words. 'Now since these customs at other feasts are not admitted here, why may not *sitting*, for the same reason, be changed, as too *bold* and *saucy* a posture, far from a becoming humility and modesty, when we are so immediately in the presence of God?' To which Mr. PIERCE replies: 'Say you so? do you think the posture the Apostles used, with our Saviour's approbation, was too bold and saucy, or not sufficiently humble and modest? Do not you see whom you injure by those reproaches? truly, not so much the Dissenters, as the Apostles, and our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ himself.\*'—So when TERIPHYLLIUS, a Cyprian bishop, having occasion before SPIRIDION to cite those words of our Lord, *Take up thy bed and walk*, used the term *κυμποδα*, as being in his opinion more elegant than the word *πραββατον*; SPIRIDION with becoming resentment replied, 'Art thou better than He who said *πραββατον*, that thou shouldst be ashamed to use his words†?' The Reader will apply these particulars to the case before us.

REFLECT. V. From the preceding Reflections it appears, I think, with superior evidence, that the sacred maxim, *I will have mercy and not sacrifice*; must be misapplied, when urged against us. For if it will apply so as to justify sprinkling in a cold country, when immersion was intended by our Lord, submitted to by him, commanded by him, and practised by the

\* *Vindication of Dissenters*, Part III. p. 204.  
*Eccl. l. i. c. i.*

† *Sozom. Hist.*

Apostles ; it would certainly have applied much more strongly in many cases under the former Economy : for the maxim is founded in moral truth, which is the same in all ages and in every nation. That *God loves mercy better than sacrifice*, was always a fact, since man transgressed and ceremonial obedience was required : nor did our Lord give the least intimation, by his application of that important saying, of any thing contained in it being peculiar to Gospel times. The Christian dispensation is indeed much superior to that of the ancient Hebrews : but that superiority is far from consisting in our having more liberty to neglect, alter, or transgress the divine appointments than they had. For as Mr. REEVES observes, ‘ When God ‘ says that he *will have mercy and not sacrifice*, it is not ‘ to be understood as if God would have any of his ‘ laws broken ; but as our Saviour explains it, *These ‘ ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other un- ‘ done* \*.’—BELLARMINE, when vindicating a mutilated administration of the holy supper, argues upon a supposition of the Gospel ‘ church having a greater ‘ liberty than the church under the Law ; though she ‘ have no power to alter things of a moral, but only ‘ such as are of a positive nature †.’ How lamentable and how shameful, to think of eminent Protestants adopting the principle and arguing upon it, in favour of pouring and sprinkling ! For I am persuaded that none of them ever considered the Jewish church as authorized by these words, *I will have mercy and not sacrifice*, to alter any divine appointment. Shall Christians, then, make more free with divine authority than Jews, because they live under a better Dispensation ? far be it ! That would represent the Holy One

\* See CHAP. I. No. 3.

† In *Morning Exercise against Popery*,

of God as the minister of sin—would be contrary to Scripture and reason, to conscience and common sense. The disciples of Christ are as much obliged to regard the positive laws of the New Testament with strict punctuality, as the Jews were to observe their divine ritual contained in the books of Moses. • Nay, our superior privileges are so many additional motives to perpetual obedience. Whenever any one therefore is inclined to substitute asperfusion for plunging, on a supposition of the latter being burdensome or indelicate, upon the foundation of those condescending words, *I will have mercy and not sacrifice*; he should recollect that command of God to Abraham, *Ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin*; and see how far the gracious declaration would have applied there, before he ventures to alter a positive appointment of Christ on that ground.

Here also the argument used by Protestant Pædobaptists in opposition to immersion, is like that of the Papists against communion in both kinds. For thus we find SALMERO argues: ‘If it had not been lawful from the beginning of the church to communicate under one species, either very many must have been entirely deprived of communion, or obliged to that which they could not perform: as is manifest with regard to those who have not plenty of wine, which is the case with many in the Northern parts of the world; in respect of those who are abstemious, and of those also that are not able to drink wine without a nausea being excited —Seeing therefore that the yoke of our Lord is easy, and his burden light, it should not be believed that he requires what is impossible, or that he obliges to communicate under both kinds \*.’—That Mr. HOR-

\* Apud CHAMIERUM, *Paræstrat.* Tom. IV. L. ix. C. iv. § 25.

I took the hint from SALMERO I dare not assert,  
 nor do I believe; but be that as it may, he has learned  
 to argue against plunging as a grievous hardship, and  
 that from the same text which is pleaded by the Papal  
 veteran for communion in one kind. For he says,  
 'Christ's yoke is easy, and his burden light. His com-  
 mandments are not grievous \*:' and hence, among  
 other things, he infers that immersion is not the pro-  
 per mode of proceeding.—This brings to remem-  
 berance a good-natured rule which Popish casuists have  
 given for the interpretation of divine laws, with a  
 view to relieve scrupulous consciences. The rule to  
 which I advert, as produced by Mr. CLARKSON, is  
 this: Persons 'must persuade themselves that they sin  
 not, though they break the law in a strict sense, if  
 they observe it according to some *complaisant* inter-  
 pretation.' A benign sense is rather to be put upon  
 any precept, than that which is strict: for the precepts  
 of God and the church are not against that *pleasant-*  
*ness* which a scrupulous interpretation takes away.  
 On which Mr. CLARKSON makes the following re-  
 mark. 'That a person may be the better pleased, he  
 may make the interpretation himself, and so make it  
 as benign as he desires, and as favourable as his in-  
 clination and interest would have it. For though in  
 other courts the interpretation belongs to him who  
 makes the law, yet, according to their St. ANTO-  
 NIUS, in the court of conscience it belongs to every  
 one to do it for his own practice †.'

Were it allowable to prosecute the hint which some  
 of these learned authors give; (No. 5, 7, 15.) that is  
 for charity and necessity to erect a court of Chancery,  
 to sit in judgment on the equity of God's commands,

\* Inf. Bap. Defend. p. 20.    † Pract. Div. of Papists, p. 384, 385.

and either mitigate their severity, or suspend them, as we think proper; something indeed then be done, that would effectually obviate all varying apprehensions, and every painful modest feeling, which the word *baptize* would otherwise excite in the breasts of any. Nor would the relief afforded by such a court, be confined to the frightful idea of plunging; for it would extend its benign influence to every other case, in which our sovereign wills happen to clash with positive laws: because the uniform language of its decrees would be that of Peter to Christ, *SPARE THYSELF*. While however the validity of such a court of equity remains doubtful, it will be our wisdom when the Most High speaks, not to reason and object, but to adore and obey.

How strange it is that Protestant authors should ever talk of dispensing with divine laws, or of mitigating their severity! Not much more detestable, though a little more blunt, is the well-known saying ascribed to ALFONSUS: *Si ego adfuissem, melius ordinassem*. But let the learned VOSSIUS assert, if he please, 'That we are compelled'—By what? not the appointment of Christ; not the design of the ordinance; nor yet by apostolic practice—but by something which he calls 'the law of *charity*, and of *necessity*,' to retain sprinkling in our churches\*: we had much rather adhere to that excellent maxim of TURRETTIN; 'The appointment of God is to us the highest law, the supreme necessity†.' With sincerity and zeal may we adopt the language of Dr. COTTON MATHER, and say; 'Let a precept be never so difficult to obey, or never so distasteful to flesh and blood; yet if I see it is God's command my soul says, *It is good; let me*

\* *Disputat. de Bap. Disp. I. § 9.*  
XIX. Quæst. XIV. § 14.

† *Institut. Theolog. Loc.*



*it till I die*\*.—Dr. WITHERSPOON has remarked, that ‘when men will not conform their practice to the principles of pure and undefiled religion, they scarce ever fail to endeavour to accommodate religion to their own practice†.’ Mr. HENRY also has justly observed, that ‘in sacraments, where there is appointed something of an outward sign, the inventions of men have been too fruitful of additions, [and of alterations too;] for which they have pleaded a great deal of *decency* and *significancy*; while the ordinance itself hath been thereby miserably obscured and corrupted‡.’ To which I will add the following remark of Dr. OSWALD: ‘To take advantage of dark surmises, or doubtful reasoning, to elude obligations of any kind, is always looked upon as an indication of a dishonest heart§.’

REFLECT. VI. Suffer me now to reason and remonstrate in the language of Mr. CHARNOCK; after which I will conclude this part of my subject with the ingenuous confession of a learned foreigner, and the declaration of Dr. WALL. ‘The wisdom of God is affronted and invaded, says the famous CHARNOCK, by introducing new rules and modes of worship, different from divine institutions. Is not this a manifest reflection on this perfection of God, as though he had not been wise enough to provide for his own honour, and model his own service; but stood in need of our directions, and the caprichios of our brains? Some have observed, that it is a greater sin, in worship, to *do* what we should not, than to *omit* what we should perform. The one seems to be out of *weakness*, because of the high exactness of the law;

\* *Life*, by Dr. JENNINGS, p. 118.

† *Treatise on Baptism*, p. 153.

‡ *Appeal to Common Sense*, p. 21.

§ *Treatise on Regene-*

*ration*, p. 178.

CHAP. VII.] *Of Sprinkling instead of Immersion.* 321

and the other out of *impudence*, accusing the wisdom of God of imperfection, and controuling it in its institutions—Whence should this proceed, but from a partial Atheism, and a mean conceit of the divine wisdom? As though God had not understanding enough to prescribe the form of his own worship; and not wisdom enough to support it, without the crutches of human prudence—The laws of God, who is *summa ratio*, are purely founded upon the truest reason, though every one of them may not be so clear to us. Therefore, they that make [any] alteration in his precepts, either dogmatically or practically, controul his wisdom and charge him with folly. When men will observe one part of his law, and not another; pick and choose where they please; hence it is that sinners are called *fools* in Scripture. 'Tis certainly inexcusable folly, to contradict undeniable and infallible wisdom. If infinite prudence hath framed the law, why is not every part of it observed? If it were not made with the best wisdom, why is any thing of it observed \*?'

The ingenuous confession to which I refer, is that of M. de la ROQUE, and it is as follows. 'The greatest part of them [the Protestants,] hitherto baptize only by sprinkling: but it is certainly an abuse; and this practice which they have retained from the Romish church, without a due examination of it, as well as many other things which they still retain, render their baptism very defective. It corrupts both the institution and ancient usage of it, and the religion it ought to have to faith, repentance, and regeneration. Monsieur BOSSUET's remark, that dipping was in use

\* *Works*, Vol. I. p. 401. *On Man's Enmity to God*, p. 112, 113.

for thirteen hundred years, deserves our serious consideration, and our acknowledgement thereupon, that we have not sufficiently examined all that we have retained from the Romish church; that seeing her most learned prelates now inform us, that it was she first abolished a usage authorized by so many strong reasons, and by so many ages, she has done very ill on this occasion, and that we are obliged to return to the ancient practice of the church, and to the institution of Jesus Christ. I do not say, that baptism by aspersion is null; that is not my opinion: but it must be confessed, if sprinkling destroys not the substance of baptism, yet it alters it, and in some sort corrupts it; 'tis a defect which spoils its lawful form \*.

The declaration of Dr. WALL is as follows: ' Since the times that dipping of infants has been generally left off, many learned men in several countries have endeavoured to retrieve the use of it: but more in England than any where else in proportion.' Then, after having mentioned SOTUS, Mr. MEDE, Bp. TAYLOR, Sir NORTON KNATCHBULL, Dr. TOWERSON, and Dr. WHITBY, as being all desirous of having immersion restored to common use, he adds: ' These, and possibly many more, have openly declared their thoughts concerning the present custom. And abundance of others have so largely and industriously proved that a total immersion was, as Dr. CAVE says, *the almost constant and universal custom of the primitive times*, that they have sufficiently intimated their inclinations to be for it now. So that no man in this nation, who is dissatisfied with the other way, or does wish, or is but willing, that his child should

\* In Mr. STENNETT's *Answer to Mr. RUSSEN*, p. 185, 186.

## CHAP. VII. OF THE MODE OF BAPTIZING.

• be baptized by dipping, need in the least to doubt that  
 • that any minister in this church would, according to  
 • the present direction of the Rubric, readily comply  
 • with his desire, and, as Mr. WALKER says, be glad  
 • of it\*.

\* *Hist. Inf. Bap.* Part II. Chap. ix. p. 473---476.---The desire of many learned men in the Church of England to have immersion restored, reminds me of another particular in that Establishment; concerning which Mr. BINGHAM, who was a true son of the Church, speaks as follows: ‘The Church of England [in her Office for Ash Wednesday.] has for two hundred years wished for the restoration of this [primitive] discipline, and yet it is but an ineffective wish: for nothing is done towards introducing it, but rather things are gone backward, and there is less discipline for these last sixty years, since the times of the unhappy confusions, than there was before.’ *Origines Eccles.* B. XV. Chap. ix. § 8. Thus Mr. HERVEY, when adverting to the subject of discipline, as practised in his own Church: ‘The grosser kind of Simony seems to be practised by a certain Court, styled *Spiritual*, or *Ecclesiastical*; which thunders out excommunications and curses, debars poor creatures from religious privileges, and causes them to be hurried with the burial of an ass; unless they pacify their pious indignation, by a little filthy lucre---This is the language of that same spiritual Judicature: *If thou wilt lug out a few crowns or guineas from thy purse, all shall be well. Heaven shall smile, and the Church open her arms. Whereas, if thou art refractory in this particular; and unwilling, or unable, to comply with our pecuniary demands; thou art cut off from the means of grace. Thou shalt no longer hear that word of the gospel, by which the spirit of faith cometh. Nor any more be partaker of that sacramental ordinance, which is a sign and seal of spiritual benefits-----*Is not this a most infamous traffic, whereby sacred things are bought and sold? In the present state of affairs, what can be a nearer approach to the sin of the mercenary Magician? What can be a more indelible blot on the purity and discipline of any church?

‘*Pudet hæc opprobria nobis*

‘*Et dici potuisse, et non potuisse reselli.*’

*Theron and Aspasio*, Vol. I. p. 351. Edit. 5th. Mr. BISSET, thus:  
 • I have returned several of my charge, for scandalous immoralities,  
 • to the Spiritual Court; but nothing was done, only some money  
 • was

*Reasons, Re-* *Plain English*, p. 28. Dublin, 1705.  
An observation of Dr. OWEN, respecting Pluralities, will here apply. 'An evil this, like that of mathematical prognostications at Rome, always condemned, and always retained.' *Gospel Church and its Government*, p. 107.

END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.











